BOSTON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Dissertation

THE DOCTRINE OF MAN IN IRENAEUS OF LYONS

by

Dai Sil Kim

(A.B., Methodist Theological College, Seoul, Korea, 1960;
S.T.B. with Doctoral Objective, Boston University School
of Theology, 1965)

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

1969

APPROVED

by

First Reader . . . . A. J. Phillips . . . . . .

Professor of Church History

Second Reader . . . . Earl Kent Brown . . .

Professor of Church History

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Writing a doctoral dissertation is like opening a door to the scholarly world. In opening this door, many people have helped me in numerous ways. I am very much indebted to the Dean and Mrs. Walter G. Muelder of the School of Theology Boston University who have constantly guided me in my educational pilgrimage away from home. I am grateful to all the professors in the School of Theology who have instructed me in theological education with their concern and spiritual guidance.

My special gratitude is due to my first reader, Dr. A. J. Phillips who has given me an excellent scholarly guidance and theological inspiration. I am equally grateful to Dr. E. K. Brown who has been my advisor for five years and has given me every encouragement to make this dissertation possible.

As I open the door to the scholarly world, I remember my parents without whom I could not have been what I am today. I dedicate this dissertation to them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Problem of the Dissertation 1
2. Definitions 5
3. Limitations 6
4. Previous Research in the Field 7
5. Method 13

II. IRENAEUS--THE MAN AND HIS TIME

1. The Christian Church in the Second Century 15
   - i. Environment of Christianity 15
     - (1) Roman Empire and Hellenistic Culture 15
     - (2) Oriental Religions 18
     - (3) Diaspora 20
   - ii. Institutionalization of Christianity--Its Causes and Results 22
     - (1) Attacks from Without 22
     - (2) Dissensions Within 26
       - (i) Gnosticism 27
       - (ii) Montanism 35

Chapter Page

(3) Institutional Changes 37

iii. Major Theological Issues and Sources . . 40

(1) Apostolic Fathers 40

(2) Apologists 44

2. Irenaeus of Lyons 47

i. Life 47

ii. Importance in Church History 51

iii. Writings 54

iv. Theological Structure and Sources . . 62

III. THE CREATION OF MAN

1. God the Creator and His Two Hands 66

2. Image and Likeness 84

3. Adam and Christ 112

i. The Primal Innocence and the Childlike Adam 112

ii. The Concept of Growth and the Perfect Image of Man in Christ 117

IV. THE FALL OF MAN--ITS CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES

1. The Devil 123

2. Adam's Fall 136

i. Freedom and Disobedience 136

(1) Adam's Confusion and Cain's Sin . 136

Chapter Page

(2) Sin and Death 143

(3) Sin and This World 165

(4) Bondage of the Law 167

ii. Freedom and Grace 181

V. MAN AND CHRIST

1. Incarnation 184

2. The Cross 203

3. Resurrection 216

VI. MAN IN THE CHURCH

1. Body of Christ 226

2. Christ and the Spirit 242

VII. MAN AT THE END

1. Reward and Judgment 255

2. Recapitulation 276

3. Deification 304

i. Becoming Man in Christ 304

ii. The Glory of God and the Glory of Man 312

VIII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 317

BIBLIOGRAPHY 337

ABSTRACT 348

AUTOBIOGRAPHY 351

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1. The Problem of the Dissertation

The problem of this dissertation is to define and describe the theological anthropology of Irenaeus of Lyons. The topic was chosen mainly on two accounts: (1) the importance of the doctrine of man both in traditional and contemporary Christian thought; (2) the unique contribution Irenaeus makes in the evolution of this doctrine to Christianity.

The question of man's nature is as old as human history, and this question is asked and answered in every generation. In our generation, however, this question challenges us in the nakedness of our existence more than ever before. Contemporary secular thought with its spirit of technology has attacked the Christian doctrine of man, and in our modest way we would like to return to those formative years of Christian theology and therein to examine the thought of one of its founders who has so much to tell us of relevance to this topic.

The acute need of defining Christian anthropology in our time has been recognized by the Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches which was held in Uppsala, July 1968. The proposal for a study of man by the Assembly reads:

> 1. In the post-Uppsala plans of several departments and divisions, as outlined in the Work Book, there is a remarkable convergence of interests to study the problems of Christian anthropology, of the humanum, its nature and future in a changing world. . . . 2. Underlying the study plans of the various departments, in this field, there seems to be a certain common denominator. It is, to put it simply, the question "What is man?" This perennial question is posed today with a great sense of urgency and existential concern. . . .[1]

Faced with the urgent task of answering the question of man's nature in our time from the Christian point of view, it is significant to study the doctrine of man in the history of Christian thought. As Samuel Laeuchli puts it so well, the present can never find its full meaning apart from the past.

> To write history is to write a dialogue. When we lose courage to debate with the scanty evidence of the past, this very evidence dies.

---

[1] World Council of Churches, Fourth Assembly, Uppsala, July 1968, Committee I, document No. 4, Policy Ref. Committee I, document No. 1. p.1.

> As there is no present without the past, there can be no description of the past apart from the joy and despair of the present.[1]

It is a task of the historical theologian to make a dialogue between present and past, and when dealing with the doctrine of man, that dialogue should center upon Irenaeus of Lyons for three significant reasons.

First, it was Irenaeus who drew up a theological anthropology under the challenge of the heretical Gnostic doctrine of man in a most formative period of Christianity. If we wish to pay due respect to the tradition of the Church as well as to the Scripture in our understanding of Christian doctrine, we must give Irenaeus an important place in our study of anthropology. A further elaboration of this point will be found in the second chapter when we deal with the life of Irenaeus and his importance in the history of Christian thought.

Second, Irenaeus demonstrates that God's omnipotence and man's glory are not two opposing factors, but are two parallel factors which are put into juxtaposition. Much of the neglect of the Church's study of man in the past has to do with the fear of lessening Theocentricity when we make a positive theological study of man. In the light of Irenaeus' understanding of man, this fear is unfounded. This is especially true since the first and foremost concern of Christian theology is Jesus Christ. In the thought of Irenaeus Christology is never separated from anthropology and vice versa. The Uppsala Assembly of the World Council of Churches asks the following questions:

---

[1] Samuel Laeuchli, The Language of Faith (New York, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), p. 7.

> Is there a distinctive Christian view of man? In what way is Jesus Christ the true revelation of authentic humanity? What are the characteristics of the "new man in Christ" and the new humanity, the Church?[1]

Irenaeus offers answers to these in a powerful theological language.

Finally, there are two divergent understandings of man, especially in relation to the mystery of evil, in the early history of Christian thought, namely, the Augustinian and Irenaean positions. This dichotomy has seldom been distinguished. For too many Christians, the Augustinian doctrine of man has been considered to be the orthodox interpretation of Christian man, while that of Irenaeus has not received the attention which it merits. It is hoped that the following study of Irenaeus' anthropology can give an alternative choice to the Christians who are confronted with the question of self-identity while struggling in the joy and despair of the present.

---

[1] World Council of Churches, Plenary Business, Document No. 53, p. 2.

2. Definitions

It is strictly with theological anthropology that we concern ourselves in this study. The anthropology Irenaeus presents is based on the fact that God is the Creator of man and the very Master of his existence. Hence we are not concerned with anthropology in the sense of the scientific study of the races, or the physical and mental characteristics, distribution, customs, and social relationships of mankind. Nor is this a philosophical explanation of man's nature. This is a study of man that is inter-related with the study of God.

3. Limitations

This dissertation is limited to the study of Irenaeus' theological anthropology, which can be best examined in three contexts: in the light of Irenaeus' entire theological system; in contrast to the Gnostic, and Hellenistic doctrines common in his day; in the history of Christian doctrine. However, the present study will not attempt an exhaustive treatment of these three. For example, while efforts will be made to relate the teachings of Irenaeus to other theologians of the early Church such as Athanasius and Gregory of Nyssa, it is not within the purview of this dissertation to do an exhaustive treatment of these latter figures.

It was also indicated that Irenaeus' doctrine of man is significant especially in contrast to that of Augustine which has been usually considered the orthodox doctrine of the Christian Church. However, we will not feel obliged to spell out the Augustinian doctrine of man in detail when we contrast it with Irenaeus' doctrine.

4. Previous Research in the Field

The primary sources for Irenaeus' doctrine of man are his own writings, i.e., Against Heresies and Proof of the Apostolic Preaching. In addition to them, there is a considerable secondary literature on Irenaeus including a number of useful books and a few articles in the historical and theological journals.

Among the secondary sources, there are several books which deal rather extensively with the theology of Irenaeus and with his life. The Biblical Theology of Saint Irenaeus by John Lawson,[1] published in 1948, is a very comprehensive book that deals with the theology of Irenaeus in general. His book consists of two parts: the first part dealing with "Saint Irenaeus on the Use of the Bible," and the second with "the Theology of Saint Irenaeus as a Biblical System." Lawson ably demonstrates that the theology which Irenaeus advocated was based on the Scripture and so Irenaeus was the most outstanding biblical theologian of the second century Christian Church. His book, therefore, helps us in grasping the theology of Irenaeus in general. The book also gives a good orientation to the German writers who had made studies on Irenaeus either at the end of the last century or at the turn of this. Here are to be found such men as Ernst Klebba, Johannes Werner, and G. Nathanael Bonwetsch.

---

[1] John Lawson, The Biblical Theology of Saint Irenaeus of Lyons (London: The Epworth Press, 1948).

Quite similar in character to the book by Lawson is Irenaeus of Lugdunum by Montgomery Hitchcock,[1] published in 1914. He gives a better sketch of the life of Irenaeus, but also deals extensively with Irenaeus' theology.

In almost all the books that deal with the history of Christian thought are to be found sections dealing with Irenaeus, but none of these gives a separate treatment of his doctrine of man. Of the books that give an excellent introduction in terms of the theological language in the history of the Church, Samuel Laeuchli's The Language of Faith is the most penetrating treatment. Dealing with the "semantic dilemma" of the early Church, this brilliant young scholar ably demonstrates that Irenaeus was the one who used the theological language that speaks of the one

---

[1] F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, Irenaeus of Lugdunum (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1914).

God and the incarnate Son in whom every Christian should be involved as the very object of his faith. Through its penetrating study of the clash between Gnostic language and the language of Irenaeus, this book gives a powerful witness that Irenaeus has a unique place in the history of the Christian theology.

There is, however, no complete study of the doctrine of man in Irenaeus in the recent years. In 1966 John Hick published a book, entitled Evil and the God of Love.[1] This book draws our attention to the contrast of Augustine and Irenaeus, and does give us a very useful insight in studying those two Christian thinkers. However, his study is a philosophical explanation of theodicy, and does not concern itself with Irenaeus' theological anthropology *per se*.

There is a book by Ernst Klebba, Die Anthropologie Des Hl. Irenaeus.[2] Klebba's work (1894) is in two parts, the whole being treated as a study in the history of dogma.

---

[1] John Hick, Evil and the God of Love (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1966).

[2] Ernst Klebba, Die Anthropologie Des Hl. Irenaeus (Munster: Verlag von Heinrich Schoningh, 1894).

The first part is entitled "biblical anthropology" and the second "speculative anthropology." In the former Klebba seeks to present the doctrinal views of Irenaeus in terms of their historical basis. In the latter he seeks to present the doctrine systematically. The discussion attempts to be a unity. Particularly in the second part Irenaeus' thought is related to spiritual and intellectual movements outside the Church. Klebba presupposes that Irenaeus developed a complete system and on the essential points is free of self-contradiction. These assumptions provided guidelines with which to deal with the material as an organic whole.

Klebba sees his work in the context of a period of scholarship dominated by such names as A. Ritschel, A. Harnack, I. A. Dorner, and others. The newer criticism, he notes, had failed to observe the criterion according to which works should be criticized, namely the purpose for which they were written.

Klebba is concerned to show why Irenaeus set about his work as he did, why he used the sources which he did, and what the overall goals of his writing were. He criticizes Harnack for making his judgments about Irenaeus on too limited a use of the sources and his lack of knowledge of specialized studies. However, he appeals to Harnack in justifying a study of Irenaeus which begins with anthropology because a knowledge of salvation and of the restoration of man depends on a knowledge of the fall and of original sin.

Klebba's concern is basically historical and so if we want to see an adequate theological anthropology of Irenaeus, we will find it desirable to give fuller treatment of the subject than Klebba does. It is to his credit that he recognizes an importance of anthropology in studying Irenaeus, but he does not quite succeed in showing the inter-relatedness of anthropology, Christology, Pneumatology, etc. Furthermore, this book, published in 1894, leaves much room for re-interpretation of Irenaeus' anthropology in the light of a more modern theological orientation than that of Klebba.

In the recent years the closest thing to a complete study of the doctrine of man in Irenaeus is the work of Gustaf Wingren, entitled Man and the Incarnation[1] which is a study of the biblical theology of Irenaeus. In this book Wingren does deal with Irenaeus' theological anthropology. The present study, however, will not be a repetition of his work for two reasons. First, in the present work we will seek a more balanced treatment of the subject from the point of view of an historical theologian. Wingren's main concern is to demonstrate the inseparable relationship between man and the Incarnation. He puts much emphasis upon the human nature of Jesus, but he does not fully explore our empirical human nature. Second, his interpretation of Irenaeus' concept of image and likeness seems to miss a crucial point in the study of Irenaeus' anthropology by not distinguishing these two. In fact, the distinguishing of image and likeness is the central issue in the entire anthropology of Irenaeus and the hardest point which scholars have to face and resolve. It will be examined carefully in the third chapter. Certainly Wingren's work will be a very valuable secondary source for this work, but Irenaeus' doctrine of man has not been exhausted by his study.

---

[1] Gustaf Wingren, Man and the Incarnation, trans. by Ross Mackenzie (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959).

5. Method

The method used in the preparation of this dissertation is historical, descriptive, and analytical. In Chapter II we shall describe the historical setting in which Irenaeus lived and worked. Our basic source is Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History and the standard secondary treatments of the period.

For the remainder of the chapters our basic sources will be the writings of Irenaeus himself, Against Heresies and Proof of the Apostolic Preaching. In chapters III to VII a careful description and analysis of the doctrine of man in Irenaeus will be undertaken. In fact it is the main concern of the present work to collect and analyze all the scattered materials on the doctrine of man in his own writings and describe them in a systematic manner.

The principles of analysis used are the following: 1. Internal coherence of the anthropology with itself and with the rest of his theology. 2. Some comparison of Irenaeus' teaching with that of some of his major contemporaries and successors. 3. Careful examination of the conflicting opinions of some of the leading scholars and an attempt at their resolution or at the formation of an independent judgment where appropriate. 4. Placing the discussion of Irenaeus' theology in the setting of his own time.

Chapter VIII will present the summary and conclusions of the doctrine of man in Irenaeus of Lyons.

CHAPTER II

IRENAEUS--THE MAN AND HIS TIME

1. The Christian Church in the Second Century

i. Environment of Christianity

(1) Roman Empire and Hellenistic Culture

In the reign of Augustus Caesar Jesus was born in Judea. Thus the glorious new hope of mankind dawned in one of the small tributary kingdoms of the great Roman Empire, which provided the immediate environment of the Christian Church when she set out her mission. The Roman Empire with its vast territory and efficient government secured many favorable as well as unfavorable conditions to the Christian Church.

First, the Empire maintained the Pax Romana which lasted until the end of the second century, except for a brief period of time after the death of Nero.

Secondly, the universal peace which was secured under this political unity was accompanied by the growth of roads, which enabled rapid and safe communication and commerce. From St. Paul's missionary journeys we learn that it was quite feasible to plan elaborate trips with full expectation of reaching one's destination at a given time.[1]

If it was the Roman Empire that provided the means of communication, it was Hellenism that actually travelled. The great legacy which the Greeks bequeathed to the Roman Empire travelled everywhere in the Empire and became the unifying force of the cultural scene of the Empire. Breaking down all the local traditions, Hellenism supplied a common language and a common culture to the people of the Empire.

Under this wide-spread Hellenism, the intellectual life was organized; and the prevailing Greek spirit urged the growth of cultural uniformity with its splendid progress in various fields such as philosophy, architecture, the other arts, etc. We can find the best example of the predominant influence of the Greek culture in the city of Alexandria where both Judaism and the Christian Church were hellenized to a degree. What happened in Alexandria happened in many other parts of the Graeco-Roman world. In fact, in many cases Hellenism became a very convenient medium between the Christian apostles, prophets and their listeners. Kidd makes an appropriate remark: "Hellenism, in a word, supplied the medium for making a creed of Jewish origin intelligible to a wider world."[1]

---

[1] Acts. 20:6-11.

Thirdly, we must discuss the moral condition of the Roman world. It is difficult to give a fair summary statement of the moral condition, but scholars trace the low level of morals without much difficulty. The age into which the Christian Church set out to spread the Gospel saw a serious crisis in the economical history of the western world. Wealth was pouring into Rome, but it tended to be accumulated in fewer hands and with it came a luxurious life. Under the overflowing wealth and luxury that were existent only on the surface of the Empire, the pressure of poverty was severely felt and the new class of paupers emerged in Graeco-Roman society.

A passion for amusement was prevalent everywhere in the Empire and it was accompanied by the debasing shows of the theatre and amphi-theatre. People were quite used to being hard-hearted and highly sensual. To make the matters worse, religion did not help raise the level of morals. On the contrary, many of the shows for amusement were the religious festivities. Thus the bold statement of Kidd that "pagan religion was the ally of an evil life"[1] is not an exaggeration. In this dark setting of morality, the world needed something new and in a way it was seeking such a new teaching. Simultaneously, any religion that would require its adherents to be highly moral was bound to have difficulties.

---

[1] B. J. Kidd, A History of the Church to A.D. 313, Vol. I (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922), p. 19.

(2) Oriental Religions

Daniélou writes of this area, "on the religious level, it was the eastern religions which triumphed; on the cultural level it was Hellenism."[2] Generally speaking, the religious situation for the first three centuries of the Empire was "a recovery, where it had been lost, of belief in the gods."[3] Especially the second century can be described as "religious"; along with the continued popularity of the old cults, there was a steady assimilation of the new ones among the masses. Walker writes,

---

[1] Ibid., p. 20.

[2] Jean Daniélou and Henri Marrou, The First Six Hundred Years, trans. by Vincent Cronin (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964), p. 134.

[3] Kidd, op.cit., p. 12.

> The great majority of those who felt religious longings simply adopted Oriental religions, especially those of a redemptive nature in which mysticism or sacramentalism were prominent features.[1]

Thus the revival of belief in the gods and the rapid spread of the oriental religions, which was enabled by the ease of communication and the great influx of oriental slaves, made the first three centuries deeply religious.

One general purpose of these eastern religions, i.e., to free people from the bondage of the flesh and to assure them a blissful immortality, had a great appeal to those who sought religious meanings in their lives. Also being rich in symbolism and highly emotional, these oriental religions gained an extensive foothold in the West. Especially many from the masses turned to these mystery religions.

Kidd rightly summarizes the inter-action of these religions and Christianity:

> . . . the Mystery-Religions of the East, though rivals of the Gospel in a sense,

---

[1] Williston Walker, A History of the Christian Church (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1959), p. 10.

> yet really told, up to a point, in its favor. Under the older paganism religion was the State's affair. It was a corporate thing, an exercise of the governing classes and an adornment of public life. But the Mysteries, like the Church, aimed at the common man. They laid themselves out to take care of, and to provide for, the individual soul. Thus they kept the sentiment of religion alive, and, in the end, the Church took their place in satisfying it.[1]

(3) Diaspora

The Assyrian and Babylonian conquests of the Jews had caused the dispersion of the Jews outisde of Palestine. In the era of the Roman Empire the Jews were so widely spread that there were few cities in the Empire without their presence.

In the era of early Christianity Judaism was divided into two; the Judaism of Palestine and that of the Diaspora, the name given to the dispersed Jews. The latter was much influenced by Hellenism, especially by Greek philosophy. Wherever the Jews went, Judaism went with them; and the encounter of Judaism and Hellenism produced many interesting Hellenistic-Jewish thinkers.

Among the most prominent Jewish thinkers who assimilated the Greek culture and philosophy was Philo of Alexandria (c.20 B.C.-50 A.D.). Many of the doctrines he produced came from the Greek philosophical systems as well as from Jewish sources, and he was to have many followers in the later generations, especially in the Alexandrine school of theology. His allegorical interpretation of Scripture and the doctrine of Logos set forth the manner in which Hellenic and Hebrew ideas might be united, and it was to be used in the development of later Christian theology.

---

[1] Kidd, op.cit., p. 20.

In the religious ferment of the Graeco-Roman world, Hellenistic Jews bore the Christian message to the gentiles, and they were very important figures in universalizing the Christian faith. However, it was not Hellenistic Judaism that ultimately won the Graeco-Roman world but Christianity itself, because Christianity was not merely the heir of Hellenistic Judaism. It absorbed Judaism or supplanted it and emerged with a faith for a new Israel. The greatest among the Christian messengers was St. Paul, and through him and many like him the Church was growing rapidly in the Graeco-Roman world.

ii. Institutionalization of Christianity--Its Causes and Results

(1) Attacks from Without

Generally speaking, the attacks from outside can be categorized into two; one is the literary attack and the other is the legal attack. The former can be best illustrated in the work of Celsus. Of the personal history of Celsus, the first great literary opponent of Christianity, we do not know much. Usually he is identified as an Epicurean with many Platonic ideas. His work *True Discourse* (Ἀληθής λόγος), written under the reign of Marcus Aurelius, is the oldest literary attack on Christianity. Its details are preserved in Origen's *Contra Celsum*. *Contra Celsum*, a series of eight books, dating from the middle of the third century, was Origen's reply to the attack addressed by Celsus.[1]

As an ardent patriot, Celsus considered Christianity an antagonist of the State and thus he undertook to compose a refutation of the teaching of Christianity. It has been a common understanding that Celsus desired to exterminate Christianity, but before we make any hasty, negative conclusion, let us examine a different view. A. C. McGiffert notes,

---

[1] Eusebius tells us about *Contra Celsum*. "He [Origen] also at this time when he was over sixty years old composed a work of eight books in answer to that entitled True Discourse, which had been written against us by Celsus the Epicurean, . . ." ("The Church History of Eusebius," *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Series Two, Vol. I, trans. by Arthur Cushman McGiffert [Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1952], IV.36, pp. 278-279).

> It is noticeable that it is not his desire to exterminate Christianity completely, but to make peace with it; to induce the Christians to give up their claim to possess the only true religion, and, with all their high ethics and lofty ideals, to join hands with the upholders of the ancient religion in elevating the religious ideas of the people, and thus benefiting the state. When we look at his work in this light (and much misunderstanding has been caused by a failure to do this), we must admire his ability, and respect his motives.[1]

This does not mean, however, that Celsus was free from the superstitions and prejudices of his age. He sought to show that Christianity is historically untenable and that it has no rational foundation. He criticized much in bibilical history for its miracles and absurdities. Moreover, he expressed his repugnant attitude toward the Christian doctrines of the Incarnation and the Cross. He also pointed out that Christians were all uncultivated mean, superstitious people; they were mechanics, slaves, women, and children.[1]

---

[1] A. C. McGiffert's footnote in ibid., p. 279.

To this kind of attack on Christianity, answers were to come from the Apologists, especially from Origen in the particular case of Celsus.

The legal attack was expressed in the form of the persecution. The Romans displayed their customary religious tolerance of local cults and interfered with religious zealots only when the latter's activities seemed to threaten public order. At first Christianity was looked upon as a Jewish sect by the Roman government and received no special attention. Soon, however, the hostility of the Jews themselves made it evident that there was a distinction between Christianity and Judaism. By the time of the disastrous fire of 64 A.D., there was a plain distinction between Judaism and Christianity: and by 90 A.D. the bearing of the name of Christian became a hazard.[2]

---

[1] All these attacks by Celsus are well preserved in Origen's "Against Celsus," The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. IV, ed. by Alexander Roberts & James Donaldson (Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1965).

[2] See I Peter 4:16.

Walker rightly describes the charges brought against the Christians as atheism and anarchy. He writes,

> Their rejection of the old gods seemed atheism; their refusal to join in emperor-worship appeared treasonable.[1]

In addition to these charges, some of the Christian teachings such as Christ's presence in the Supper created a misunderstanding among the populace who thought of the sacrament as cannibalism.

After the persecution under Nero, followed those under Domitian (81-96) and Trajan (98-117). Under the latter Ignatius of Antioch and a number of others were martyred. In Trajan's reply to Pliny, we grasp some aspect of the rationale of the attitude taken by the government dignitaries toward the Christians. It reads as following:

> You have taken the right line, my dear Pliny, in examining the cases of those denounced to you as Christians, for no hard and fast rule can be laid down, of universal application. (2) They are not to be sought out; if they are informed against, and the charge is proved, they are to be punished, with this reservation--that if any one denies that he is a Christian, and actually

---

[1] Walker, op.cit., p. 43.

> proves it, that is by worshipping our gods, he shall be pardoned as a result of his recantation, however suspect he may have been with respect to the past. Pamphlets published anonymously should carry no weight in any charge whatsoever. They constitute very bad precedent, and are also out of keeping with this age.[1]

Then came the persecution under the Emperor Marcus Aurelius (161-180). It was under this persecution that St. Polycarp and Justin were martyred. The next one arose chiefly in Egypt and Africa under the Emperor Septimius Severus (193-211). After this five big persecutions followed in turn until the decree of Milan in 313. Despite all these persecutions, Christians kept their loyalty to Christ through the noble spirit of martyrdom.

(2) Dissensions Within

If the Church had to face an immense peril from outside attack, the challenges from within were more serious, because these heretical ideas won a wide-spread adherence under the pretext of Christianity.

---

[1] Henry Bettenson, ed., Documents of the Christian Church (London: Oxford University Press, 1963), p. 6.

(i) Gnosticism

One of the forces operating in the Christian area in the second century was Gnosticism. Since it was against Gnosticism that Irenaeus composed his book, Against Heresies, it is very significant to understand it. At the same time, since we will have to deal with various teachings of Gnosticism in the process of our discussion about Irenaeus' anthropology, Gnosticism will not be fully elaborated under the present heading.

The name Gnosticism comes from the Greek word, γνῶσις, the original generic term for knowledge. In fact it is this word gnosis which binds together all different sects under the name of Gnosticism, despite the fact that it covers such a wide variety of religious phenomena in the early period of the Christian Church. Thus Robert Grant writes,

> Yet there was something about all these systems which has made it possible for writers ancient and modern to treat them together, to call them Gnostic. The very word gnosis shows that the Gnostic knows. He does not know because he has gradually learned; he knows because revelation has been given. He does not believe, for faith is inferior to gnosis. And his gnosis, "the knowledge of the ineffable

greatness," is itself perfect redemption.[1]

Unlike the Christian theologians who liked uniformity, the Gnostics were fond of variety and novelty. Thus it is not feasible to discuss all the different Gnostic systems, but there are some common tenets among all different Gnostic systems: (1) All the Gnostic schools taught the radical dualism that governs the relation of God and the world, and correspondingly that of man and the world. Thus they set an eternal antagonism between God and matter. (2) Accordingly, when they tried to explain the origin of this material world, they taught the doctrine of the Demiurge, thus rejecting the attribution of the origin of this world to God. Hans Jonas describes the notion of the universe in the Gnostic systems as "a vast prison whose innermost dungeon is the earth, the scene of man's life."[2] In the light of this teaching, then, the vastness and multiplicity of the cosmic system expresses the degree to which man is removed from God. Many of the Gnostic teachers identified the God of the Old Testament with the creative Demiurge. Thus it is not strange that Marcion rejected the Old Testament completely.

---

[1] Robert M. Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1959), p. 7.

[2] Hans Jonas, The Gnostic Religion (Boston: Beacon Press Beacon Hill, 1958), p. 43.

(3) There are some common tenets in the Gnostic anthropology. The Gnostics taught the trichotomy of man; man is composed of flesh, soul, and spirit. Reduced to ultimate principles, however, man's origin is twofold, i.e., mundane and extra-mundane. His extra-mundane origin makes him the alien in the world and makes him yearn for the return to his true home. Accordingly, the pneumatic morality of the Gnostics is determined by hostility toward the world and contempt for all mundane ties.[1] And since the true liberation of man comes through knowledge, the elite of mankind is free from the yoke of the moral law. Thus Grant notes,

> Gnostics were ultimately devoted not to mythology but to freedom. Speculation and mythology were aspects of this freedom, which involved freedom from astral spirits, from the god of the Old Testament, from the tyranny of the creation, from Old Testament law or any law. . . . As Puech expresses it, using psychological terms, "from an 'alienated' existence we return to our ontological condition, to the deep, total and permanent reality of our ego; we pass, as our writings say, from the domain of the 'cosmos,' from the temporal and phenomenal world to the aeon, to the eternal

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 44.

and non-temporal."[1]

Thus in order to understand the Gnostic concept of man and his redemption, cosmology and cosmogony are the necessary background. The Gnostic has a cosmic explanation for his tragically bereft existence on earth and the goal of the Gnostic is to reascend to the realm of the divine. For the Gnostic the realm of the divine is the spiritual realm. Samuel Laeuchli makes an appropriate remark, saying, "The metaphysical twist killed any realistic understanding of 'new heaven' and a 'new heart.'"[2] So it was impossible for the Gnostics to accept God's act in both flesh and spirit.

(4) In nearly every case, the Gnostic redeemer is the Christian Jesus, even though the content of his gnosis is not Christian. In relation to this, all the Gnostics taught Docetism, that is, the resolution of the human element in the person of the Redeemer into mere deceptive appearence. Thus they have a Soter descending down to help man free himself and return to his ontological condition.

---

[1] Grant, op.cit., pp. 12-13. Grant speaks of the Gnostic freedom as "existentialist-psychological meaning." Even though there is a gap between the ancient Gnosticism and modern existentialism, "there is a good deal of resemblance between gnosis and existentialism." (p. 13).

[2] Laeuchli, op.cit., p. 82.

Samuel Laeuchli puts all these metaphysical entanglements in a neat package:

> Dualistic language as construct (interpretation) and dualistic language as projection (expression) are the two aspects in the dualistic semantics of Gnosticism which must be seen together in order to perceive Gnostic redemption. Pneuma fell: dualism is explained; the Soter came down: dualism is challenged; pneuma ascends through gnosis: dualism is conquered.[1]

Our summary of the common Gnostic tenets makes it evident that what the Gnostics sought to do was "to explain the riddle of man's plight in a universe he feels to be alien to himself,"[2] as Kelly well puts it. Also Gnostic dualism frees the supreme God from the responsibility for the evil that is prominent in the world.

Hans Jonas categorizes Gnosticism largely into two types; the Iranian and Syrian-Egyptian. It is not an easy task to see the origin of Gnosticism. The modern scholarship tends to see a close relationship between the rise of Gnosticism and the failure of the Jewish Apocalyptic hope. For instance, R. M. Grant writes,

> I should not claim that everything in gnosis can be explained as due to the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 63.

[2] J. N. D. Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1959), p. 26.

> failure of Jewish apocalyptic hopes. All I should claim is that the failure of the apocalyptic led to the rise of the new forms of religious expression in which the old, while still present, was transposed and transformed. When Hans Jonas defines gnosis as "anti-cosmic and eschatological dualism," it seems to me that the eschatological dualism is Jewish (and ultimately Iranian) in origin, while the anti-cosmic aspect arises out of a belief that God in this cosmos has failed to act on behalf of his people.[1]

After all is said about the possible relationship between Judaism and Gnosticism, scholars like Daniélou and Grant claim that what differentiates Gnosticism from Judaism or from Jewish Christianity is the "ontological dualism" of the Gnostic system. However, Grant argues that Gnosticism is not Greek in origin as some scholars contended, but that it originates from historical experience on the basis of "(1) the nonphilosophical nature of Gnosticism and (2) the relative rarity of this kind of dualism among Hellenistic philosophers."[2] The position taken by Grant is based on a strong foundation, but it is a matter of emphasis when it comes to the discussion of the origin of Gnosticism. After all, a central characteristic of the Gnostic system is the amalgamating tendency. Thus the influence of the Greek philosophy cannot be readily denied.

---

[1] Grant, op.cit., pp. 36-37. Daniélou is in agreement with Grant when he writes, "The tragic sense that the Apocalypse has failed to happen, which is the historical starting point of Gnosticism, here for the first time found speculative expression and became a theology, a doctrine which proved profoundly attractive; Valentinus had his own school." (Daniélou and Henry Marrou, op.cit., pp. 99-100).

[2] Grant, op.cit., p. 38.

A few of the more important Church Fathers who have informed us about the Gnostic systems are Justin, Irenaeus of Lyons, Hippolytus, and Tertullian. Usually the Christian tradition represented the founder of Christian Gnosticism to be Simon Magnus, but more well known and gifted teachers were Valentinus (Rome 135-165), Basilides (Alexandria about 130), and Marcion (active in Rome, d. about 160).

Whether we treat the Gnostics as Christians who sought to make a rapid conquest of Christianity for the Hellenic culture, and vice versa, or as extra-Christians who reacted against the rising universal religion with the ancient syncretistic tendency,[1] it is apparent that the Gnostics brought the dilemma of the Church into open.

---

[1] J. L. Neve, A History of Christian Thought, Vol. I (Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1946), p. 56.

Gnosticism made it clear that the Christian language is to be challenged by every generation thinking in its own terms. And to meet this challenge is the very dilemma of the Church. Gnosticism brought forth the sense of urgency of safeguarding the faith of the Bible.

Gnosticism was a great peril to the Church, especially in the period when the issue of kerygmatic faith of the Bible was not clear. The Gnostics distorted the concept of history held by the Church and so they were unable to grasp the full value of the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation, the Cross, and the Resurrection. Their attempt to solve the problem of the human plight in this world in result brought the moral nihilism and libertinism, which was a definite peril to the actual human situation.

Thus it became the Church's task to combat Gnosticism to safeguard her faith in God the Father Almighty the Maker of heaven and earth, and in the Father who so loved the world that He gave His only Son.

(ii) Montanism

Our sources for the knowledge of Montanism are found chiefly in the writings of Tertullian who himself was involved in the movement, in Eusebius who quotes from the anonymous anti-Montanistic writer, and in the fragments of Apollonius' work. Montanism was also called "Phrygian heresy"[1] because it took its rise in Phrygia.

It was a prophetic movement initiated by Montanus of Phrygia who, with two women, Maximilla and Priscilla, claimed himself to have received the chrisma of prophecy. Theologically Montanism was characterized by the eschatological tone it carried giving the importance to visions and revelations which its prophets were said to have received, while supernaturally called and endowed by the Spirit. In relation to this eschatological emphasis, they advocated the earthly kingdom which will last for a thousand years. The time of the Paraclete had begun with the coming of Montanus, and the new Jerusalem was going to be inaugurated.

Along with this kind of eschatological belief they preached a rigid asceticism, thus appealing very powerfully to the sterner moralists, stricter disciplinarians, and more deeply pious minds among the Christians. Apparently Tertullian was a good example who was attracted by the asceticism and disciplinary rigor of the sect.

---

[1] Eusebius, op.cit., V.16, p. 229.

Montanism spread rapidly in Asia Minor, North Africa and even in Rome and stirred many keen minds of the Christian Church. If Gnosticism was a problem that made the second century Church define the Christian theology, Montanism was a movement that urged the Church to state its attitude toward moral life and discipline, especially toward the involvedment in the world. In fact, the Montanists were relatively orthodox in their theology, and so it was in the sphere of life and discipline rather than in that of theology that they were a problem to the Church. If Gnosticism brought a theological challenge to the Church as she exists in the midst of the world, Montanism brought an ethical challenge to the Church. In a sense Montanism was a good indication that the Church is always in need of prophets as she struggles in the midst of the worldliness.

(3) Institutional Changes

It was during the second century that Christianity took on many of its institutional forms. Apparently the schismatic threat to Christianity was at work behind the endeavor to establish the oneness of the body of Christ by using some hierarchical means. Christianity, as it grew, also had some internal problems that would necessitate the somewhat centralized institution. Problems of the finance of the Church, discord among the leaders--all these problems made it necessary for the Church to seek for some kind of organized system under charismatic leadership. It was also possible that the Church sought for the form of institution that would be most convenient in the struggle against the Empire. Thus there were a number of elements at work, both internal and external, in the creation of the forms of the second century Christian Church.

It is a general conjecture that the second century Church created the monachical episcopacy[1] and sought for the charismatic leadership in the post of bishop. What the second century Christians did not want was chaos; they wanted to have some kind of established concreteness. The Church was in local concreteness (una) first, but the historical situation forced the Church into universalis. Thus Laeuchli writes,

---

[1] Monsignor Louis Duchesne, Early History of the Christian Church: From Its Foundation to the End of the Third Century, Rendered into English from the fourth edition, Vol. I (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1925), p. 67. Also see Walker, op.cit., p. 57.

> The church of one city is drawn into the struggle of the church in another city. The conflicts of Antioch are the conflicts of Smyrna. The unity of Rome and the unity of Corinth are one concern.[1]

The second century creation of episcopacy, however, does not mean that the Church is an hierarchical institution with the emphasis on Roman primacy in the Roman Catholic sense.

At the same time the Church as an institution was beginning to face the danger of obscuring the Christological primacy of the Kerygma with her impoverished institutional language. If the second century Church was in need of the institution of bishop, the need of safeguarding the biblical faith was even more urgent. Indeed, the canonization of the New Testament was a great achievement of the second century Christian Church. Of course, the basic material for the canon of Christian faith was present at the end of the first century. However, it was the Church's task to canonize the material that speaks of God's act in Christ through selection and then through addition.

---

[1] Laeuchli, op.cit., p. 139.

Our evidence that the canon is emerging appears in an allusion of Melito of Sardis (d. c. 190) preserved by Eusebius, in the works of Irenaeus (c. 130-c. 200) and Tertullian (c. 160-c. 220), and in the so-called Muratorian fragment (170). All four lists include the four gospels, Acts, thirteen letters attributed to Paul, the apocalypse and first John.

Thus it was during the second century that we see the birth of the Christian canon. The significance of this is well expressed when Laeuchli defines the canon:

> The canon is man's word about God's act in Christ, a human word which God accepts and through which he reaches the world. In this human document God addresses the world of darkness by the power of a word as he addressed the people of Israel by a Son born of Mary.[1]

The Church as a worshipping community was also in inevitable need of the confession of faith and ritual to express her faith. The formulation of creed was a natural product of the worshipping community. The creed developed its official character in connection with baptism. Thus we see the transformation of the baptismal confession into the apostolic rule of faith.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p, 234.

iii. Major Theological Issues and Sources

(1) Apostolic Fathers

Altaner defines the Apostolic Fathers as "a name given to a circle of authors who had actually or allegedly still been in touch with the apostles themselves."[1] They left us writings from which we have theological teachings that can be considered a fairly immediate echo of the preaching of the apostles. A group of Christian writers who are called Apostolic Fathers, therefore, give us valuable Christian teachings from the first and second centuries.

It was patrologist J. B. Cotelier who edited five ecclesiastical writers under the title of _patres aevi apostolici_.[2] They were _Barnabas_, _Clement of Rome_,

---

[1] Berthold Altaner, _Patrology_, trans. by Hilda C. Graef (New York: Herder and Herder, 1961), p. 97.

[2] _Ibid_., p. 97.

Ignatius, Polycarp and Hermas. In later times, however, Papias and the Epistle to Diognetus were added, and recently the Didache also came to be included in the editions. This classification does not indicate a homogeneous group of writings. Quasten testifies to this when he writes,

> The Shepherd of Hermas and the Letter of Barnabas belong, as far as form and content are concerned, to the Apocrypha, while, because of its purpose, the Letter to Diognetus should be put with the works of the Greek Apologists.[1]

For the Apostolic Fathers the Old Testament played a key role in the transmission of faith. Perhaps it is for this reason that the nomos represents a favorite concept in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers. Laeuchli writes,

> In Gnosticism, we noted, not absence, but the relative unimportance of ethical language; here the picture is reversed. There is ethical speech all the way through! Christ is almost identified with the law.[2]

Thus Laeuchli uses the term, "the language of command" for the teachings of the Apostolic Fathers due to the extreme moralistic and legalistic language in much of this literature.[1] Then he indicates that a language of merit follows a language of ethical command.[2]

---

[1] Johannes Quasten, Patrology, Vol. I (Westminster: Newman Press, 1950), p. 40.

[2] Laeuchli, op.cit., p. 94.

Thomas F. Torrance also advocates the same view in his book, The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers. He writes,

> Grace by its very nature, in the thought of the New Testament, must be the absolutely predominant factor in faith, else it is not grace. In the Apostolic Fathers grace did not have that radical character. The great presupposition of the Christian life, for them, was not a decisive significance that cut across human life and set it in a wholly new basis grounded upon the self-giving of God. What took absolute precedence was God's call to a new life in obedience to revealed truth.[3]

Thus Laeuchli and Torrance both point out that in the literature of the Apostolic Fathers the concept of charis has not been freed from the undertone of merit. Torrance writes, "They did not live from God so much as toward him."[4] The importance of the didactic trend in the post-Apostolic literature weakens the Kerygma of the Gospel.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 95.

[2] Ibid., p. 96.

[3] Thomas F. Torrance, The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers (Edinburgh, London: Oliver and Boyd, 1948), p. 133.

[4] Ibid., p. 135.

Even with the weakened notion of Kerygmatic language of the Gospel and a strong Pauline language of the Christian message, the value of the Apostolic Fathers should not be under-estimated. Granted that there is a strong tendency of over-shadowing a language of proclamation with the language of command in the literature of the Apostolic Fathers, it is also true that a strong Christological language is also present in it with a vivid longing for Christ and a desire to be like Him and to live like Him. We only have to read the letters of Ignatius in order to find the vivid Christ language. Thus Laeuchli writes, "In his seven letters, Ignatius presents an extensive documentation of christological language in the wake of biblical communication."[1] It should also be noted that Ignatius, having contacts with Asia Minor, had close kinship with the school of Asia Minor. Ignatius' Christian mysticism and doctrine of redemption reflect the theology of the Asia Minor School.

---

[1] Laeuchli, op.cit., p. 107.

On account of the direct relation of the Apostolic Fathers to the apostles in one way or the other, the person of Christ is still vividly remembered by them and often their longing for the departed Savior is expressed in a mystical tone.

Also typical of this literature is an eschatological character; the Apostolic Fathers are eagerly expecting the imminent second coming of Christ. Thus the Apostolic Fathers do not fail to offer us a valuable theological source for an important period of the Christian Church.

(2) Apologists

If the Apostolic Fathers left us writings that were directed to the guidance and edification of the faithful,[1] the Apologists left us writings that were directed to reasoned defence and recommendation of the Christian faith to the outsiders. Belonging to the period when Christianity was making converts among the educated classes, and at the same time having conflict with the State over the right to exist (c. 120-220), these Christian writers attempted to give a theoretical self-defence of the Christian faith.

---

[1] Quasten, op.cit., p. 186.

Faced with the charge that the Church was a peril to the State, the Apologists insisted that "the faith was a dominant force for the maintenance and welfare of the world, not only emperor and State but civilization itself."[1] It was also their task to face the aggressive pagan philosophy and general outlook of the period and enter discussion with pagan philosophy. In order to do this, they adopted a scholarly reasoning in the form of apologetic discussion.

Along with the challenge from the pagan philosophy, they also had to meet the specifically Jewish objections. The Apologists revealed the absurdities and immorality of the pagan religions, and defended monotheism and the doctrine of the resurrection. They devoted much attention to the application of the Old Testament prophecy to Christianity. They also indicated that pagan philosophy failed to offer the whole truth, resting only on human reason. Only Christainity could offer the whole truth because of Christ who is the Logos. Their teaching that the Logos, Divine Reason itself, comes down through Christ upon earth, won a permanent place in Christian theology.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 186-187.

These Apologists include Aristides, Justin Martyr, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Minucius Felix, and Tertullian. Most of them were Greeks, and it has been often pointed out that their effort resulted in a Hellenization of Christianity. Scholars like Altaner and Quasten, however, are in favor of saying "a Christianization of Hellenism" rather than "a Hellenization of Christianity."[1]

Granted that they were the children of their age and were much influenced by the Greek philosophy and the general outlook of the age, their importance is not diminished. They left us an important Christian literature that addressed itself to the outside world, entering the domain of culture and science.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 187. Altaner, *op.cit.*, p. 117.

2. Irenaeus of Lyons

i. Life

Of the life of Irenaeus, not much is known. He was probably born of Greek parentage, at or in the neighborhood of Smyrna, between the years 130 and 160. Almost every single writer on Irenaeus' life mentions that he had seen and listened to the teaching of the aged Polycarp. Irenaeus himself witnesses to the fact that he had known Polycarp, writing in his book, Against Heresies,

> But Polycarp also was not only instructed by apostles, and conversed with many who had seen Christ, but was also, by apostles in Asia, appointed bishop of the Church in Smyrna, whom I also saw in my early youth, for he tarried [on earth] a very long time, and, when a very old man, gloriously and most nobly suffering martyrdom, departed his life, having always taught the things which he had learned from the apostles, and which the Church has handed down, and which alone are true.[1]

Eusebius also writes that Irenaeus was well acquainted with Polycarp.[2] Thus we can say with much certainty that Irenaeus was influenced by the aged Polycarp and respected him with all his heart. It is also noteworthy that Polycarp was the disciple of Ignatius of Antioch who had been a disciple of St. John. Considered in this way, then, we can point out that Irenaeus was separated by only two generations from the Lord Himself, being in the third generation of discipleship.

---

[1] Irenaeus, "Against Heresies," The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. I, ed. by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1885) II.1.1, p. 369. Henceforth it will be cited as Against Heresies.

[2] Eusebius, op.cit., V.20, p. 238 & IV.14, p. 187.

Among other persons whom Irenaeus was acquainted with was Justin Martyr. On the basis of his book, Against Heresies, III.33, Hitchcock points out with much probability that Irenaeus spent some years of his early manhood in Rome, where he encountered the Gnostics and studied the works of Justin Martyr.[1] Eusebius indicates the possible influence of Justin Martyr on Irenaeus in this manner:

> And the discourses of the man [Justin] were thought so worthy of study even by the ancients, that Irenaeus quotes his words: . . .[2]

In Irenaeus' own book, Against Heresies, IV.6.2, we have a quotation from Justin's book Against Marcion.[3]

As to how Irenaeus came to be connected with Gaul, we do not have any certain information. For unknown reasons,

---

[1] Hitchcock, op.cit., p. 3.

[2] Eusebius, op.cit., IV.18, p. 197.

[3] Against Heresies, IV.6.2, p. 468.

Irenaeus left Asia Minor and went to Gaul. Then we know that sometime during the persecution of A.D. 177 Irenaeus was a presbyter of the Church of Lyons and that he was sent with a letter from the Gallican confessors to Eleutherus, bishop of Rome, with reference to the schism of Montanus. Eusebius' report is as follows:

> The same witnesses also recommended Irenaeus, who was already at that time a presbyter of the parish of Lyons, to the above-mentioned bishop of Rome, saying many favorable things in regard to him, as the following extract shows:
>
> "We pray, father Eleutherus, that you may rejoice in God in all things and always. We have requested our brother and comrade Irenaeus to carry this letter to you, and we ask you to hold him in esteem, as zealous for the covenant of Christ. For if we thought that office could confer righteousness upon any one, we should commend him among the first as presbyter of the church, which is his position."[1]

Then Eusebius reports that the bishop of Lyons, Pothinus, who was 90 years of age, died with the other martyrs in Gaul and that Irenaeus succeeded him in the episcopate of the Church at Lyons.[2] The date of his succession must have been approximately A.D. 178.

---

[1] Eusebius, op.cit., V.4, p. 219.

[2] Ibid., V.5, p. 220.

Not many factual incidents about his life are known after he became the bishop of Lyons. Eusebius, however, reports in detail about the role Irenaeus played as a peacemaker when Pope Victor I excommunicated the Asiatics in the Paschal controversy. Eusebius writes,

> Thus Irenaeus, who truly was well named, became a peacemaker in this matter, exhorting and negotiating in this way in behalf of the peace of the churches. And he conferred by letter about this mooted question, not only with Victor but also with most of the other rulers of the Churches.[1]

Thus he lived up to his name, for he proved himself to be a real peacemaker, εἰρηνοποιός, by exhorting Victor on behalf of the Asiatics. Irenaeus also seems to have lived the life of a busy missionary bishop.

After this incident, we do not have any more information about his life; even the year of his death is unknown. There are, however, some scholars who conjecture the possible martyrdom of Irenaeus. Eusebius does not give any hint of his martyrdom, which makes it rather doubtful. Hitchcock expresses his opinion in regard to this matter in the following words:

---

[1] Ibid., V.24, p. 244. For a detailed report about the whole issue of the Paschal controversy and Victor's attitude toward it, see ibid., V.23, pp. 241-242.

> And whether he suffered as a martyr or not, he was prepared for martyrdom, his principle of life being, to use the aphorism of Whichcote, "The nearer approach to God will give us more use of ourselves."[1]

ii. Importance in Church History

When Altaner writes that "Irenaeus is the most important of the second century theologians and in a certain sense the Father of Catholic dogmatics,"[2] in fact he is expressing the general consensus of the scholars. It was Irenaeus of Lyons who drew up the biblical theology in a most formative period of Christianity. Eusebius mentions Irenaeus as he reports about the ecclesiastical writers that flourished in the time of Irenaeus. He writes of them,

> From them has come down to us in writing, the sound and orthodox faith received from apostolic tradition.[3]

The fact that Eusebius quotes Irenaeus quite often points to the importance of Irenaeus in the history of the Church.[4]

---

[1] Hitchcock, op.cit., p. 18.

[2] Altaner, op.cit., p. 150. Quasten also writes, "Irenaeus of Lyons is by far the most important of the theologians of the second century." (op.cit., p. 287).

[3] Eusebius, op.cit., III.21, p. 197.

[4] Ibid., V.5, p. 220, V.6, p. 221, V.8, p. 222.

We have already noticed how highly Irenaeus was esteemed by his contemporaries in the recommendation letter which he carried to the bishop Eleutherus.[1]

The importance of Irenaeus in the history of the Church should be recognized in that he summarized the second century theology, using the Bible and the tradition of the Church as the sole foundation. We should be specially aware of the fact that Irenaeus spoke of the Christian doctrine, not as an individual scholar, but as the bishop theologian of the Holy Catholic Church. Often we read Eusebius reporting that Irenaeus wrote against Schismatics at Rome. Irenaeus was well qualified to write the theology of the Church as the one who had been acquainted with the first or second successors of the apostles.[2] Especially we find the importance of Irenaeus in relation with Asia Minor school of thought. Asia Minor had a very distinct place in the Ancient Church with prosperous Christian ' communities that were linked in theology and Church practice. Asia Minor Churches expounded a Christian mysticism and doctrine of redemption from an early date. Thus they established an important theological tradition. Some of the prominent figures who belong to this tradition are Ignatius of Antioch, Polycarp, Melito of Sardis, and Irenaeus. F. L. Cross writes of Melito of Sardis as "one of the most prolific and enterprising theologians of the middle of the second century," and he also points out that the tradition of Asia Minor reached its full development in Irenaeus.[1] Then in the later generation we have great Cappadocians who belong to this tradition.

---

[1] Supra, p. 49.

[2] Eusebius, op.cit., V.20, p. 237.

We should also recognize the indirect contribution of Irenaeus in preserving the knowledge of the Ancient Church. Irenaeus offers much knowledge about the heretics who disturbed the second century Christian Church, for he had to record many prevalent systems of the heretical doctrines in his effort to refute them.

Finally, his importance in the history of the Church can be seen in terms of his activities. He was a bishop who was very active in administrative matters. Frequently scholars speak of him as a missionary bishop, and we have already learned of his role as a peacemaker by writing and exhorting. He embodied the spirit of ecumenism and strived to preserve the unity of the Church.

---

[1] F. L. Cross, The Early Christian Fathers (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1960), pp. 100-101.

iii. Writings

We have a report from Eusebius as to the writings of Irenaeus. He writes,

> Besides the works and letters of Irenaeus which we have mentioned, a certain book of his On Knowledge, written against the Greeks, very concise and remarkably forcible, is extant; and another, which he dedicated to a brother Marcian, In Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching; and a volume containing various Dissertations, in which he mentions the Epistles to the Hebrews and the so-called Wisdom of Solomon, making quotations from them. These are the works of Irenaeus which have come to our knowledge.[1]

Thus it seems to be clear that Irenaeus wrote several works in his native Greek, but only two of them have been preserved. Even these two works, however, have not come down to us in the language in which they were written. Of these two, his chief work is Ἔλεγχος καὶ ἀνατροπὴ τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως and is usually called *Adversus haereses*. In English it is referred to as

---

[1] Eusebius, *op.cit.*, V.26, p. 244.

Against Heresies.[1] Eusebius tells us that it was during the time of Eleutherus that Irenaeus composed this work,[2] but he does not give the exact date of the composition.

Unfortunately, we do not have Against Heresies in the original language; we have what is thought to be a very literal Latin translation and a few fragments of the original Greek, preserved through later ecclesiastical writers such as Hippolytus, Eusebius, and Epiphanius. Then recently we have found the fourth and fifth books in an Armenian translation. A general consensus of the scholars is that the Armenian translation reproduces the original Greek text faithfully. There are also twenty-three pieces preserved in Syriac.[3]

The Latin version of the Against Heresies is preserved in a number of manuscripts. We do not know the exact date of this translation; H. Jordan and A. Souter think that it was translated in North Africa sometime between 370-420. H. Koch assigns the date of the translation before

---

[1] Altaner translates the title of the work as "Unmasking and Refutation of the False Gnosis." (op.cit., p. 150). Quasten translates it as "Detection and Overthrow of the Pretended but False Gnosis." (op.cit., p. 289).

[2] Eusebius, op.cit., V.5, p. 220. Eleutherus reigned 174-189.

[3] Altaner, op.cit., p. 151. Cf. The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching, trans. by J. A. Robinson (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1920), p. 1.

250, and W. Sandy places it as early as 200.[1]

Against Heresies is composed of two parts. In his refutation of the Gnostic heresy, Irenaeus starts with a detailed description of the doctrine of the Valentinians and then he gives a survey of Gnosticism from Simon Magnus onwards. He cites many leaders of Gnostic schools such as Satornil, Basilides, Carpocrates, Cerinthus, Cerdon, Marcion, Tatian, etc.. Irenaeus tells us that it is impossible to trace all the different teachings by the numerous Gnostic leaders. Thus he writes,

> And while they affirm such things as these concerning the creation, every one of them generates something new, day by day, according to his ability; for no one is deemed "perfect" who does not develop among them some mighty fictions.[2]

Although the description of all ~~these~~ Gnostic leaders and schools are confined to the first book, it is invaluable for the history of Gnosticism.

In the second part, Irenaeus vehemently overthrows the fantastic system of the Gnostic teachings and elaborates the foundation principles of the Christian theology. He refutes the gnosis of the Valentinians and Marcionites based on reason in the second book. In Book III Irenaeus deals with God and Christ based on the doctrine of the Church. In Book IV he overthrows the Gnostic teachings from the sayings of the Lord. Thus Irenaeus presents Christian teachings based on the Gospels and tradition. Finally, Book V treats almost exclusively the resurrection of the flesh, which was denied by all the Gnostics.[1]

---

[1] Quasten, op.cit., p. 291. Cf. Cross, op.cit., p.111.

[2] Against Heresies, 1.18.1, p. 343.

Most of the scholars indicate that the individual parts of Against Heresies were written intermittently.[2] Precisely because of this reason, the whole work suffers from a lack of clear arrangement and unity of thought. In fact, Irenaeus himself does not pretend that he has an ability to write a piece of artistic literature in which he can shape his materials into a homogeneous whole. He writes,

> Thou wilt not expect from me, who am resident among the Keltae, and am accustomed

---

[1] Altaner, op.cit., p. 151. Quasten, op.cit., p. 289.

[2] Altaner, op.cit., p. 151. Quasten, op.cit., p. 289.

> for the most part to use a barbarous dialect, any display of rhetoric, which I have never learned, or any excellence of composition, which I have never practised, or any beauty and persuasiveness of style, to which I make no pretensions.[1]

Nonetheless, his work remains as the greatest source for the knowledge of the Gnostic systems and the theology of the early Church.[2]

The first printed copy of Against Heresies was given to the world by Erasmus in 1526. Since then a number of reprints have been produced. Some of the scholars who edited this work include: F. Feuardent, whose work was published in Cologne, 1596; J. E. Grabe, whose edition came in Oxford, 1702; and the Benedictine monk, R. Massuet, whose work appeared in Paris, 1710. Massuet's work was reprinted in Venice in 1724 and in Paris by Abbe Migne in 1857. Then we have A. Stieren's edition in 1853 and in the year 1857 we have a Cambridge edition by the Rev. Wignan Harvey, which was reprinted in 1965. It is these two latter editions that we used for the present writing, for being later editions than the others, they offer us good texts with appropriate remarks. However, all the quotations in the main body of the writing come from the English translation in the Ante-Nicene Fathers.

---

[1] Against Heresies, I.preface.3, p. 316.

[2] Adolph Harnack compares Irenaeus' work with that of Tertullian and points out that "the great work of Irenaeus is far superior to the theological writings of Tertullian." (History of Dogma, Vol. II, trans. from the third German edition by Neil Buchanan /London, Edinburgh, Oxford: Williams & Norgate, 1896/, p. 236).

Besides this main work, we have another work, entitled Ἐπίδειξις τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ κηρύγματος (The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching or the Proof of the Apostolic Preaching). Even though we knew the title of this work from Eusebius' report, it has only recently been found in an Armenian translation, and no portion of it seems to have survived in any other language. The manuscript was found in December 1904, in the Church of the Blessed Virgin at Eriwan in Armenia by Dr. Karapet Ter-Mekerttschian, and it was edited by him with a translation into German, in conjunction with Dr. Erwand Ter-Minassiantz in 1907, in the Texte und Untersuchungen. The original Armenian translation was probably written between 1270-1289, in the time of Archbishop John, the bother of King Hetum of Cilicia.

Scholars conjecture that it was written after the completion of the greater work, Against Heresies, and so the date of the composition of the work falls about A.D. 190. J. A. Robinson gives a good description of the character of the work when he writes,

> The work Against Heresies is, of course, controversial from first to last: but the present treatise is a sort of Vade mecum for an intelligent Christian, explaining his faith, placing it in its historical setting in relation to Judaism, and confirming it by the citation and exposition of a great number of Old Testament passages. It is in no sense a manual for catechumens: it is a handbook of Christian Evidence, though its form is not controversial.[1]

The work is composed of two parts besides the first three chapters where we find some introductory remarks on the motives which led to the writing of this work. The first part (ch.4-42) presents the essential content of the Christian faith. Altaner calls this part "a theological part," because here monarchy, Trinity, and baptism are treated. The second part (ch.43-97) is a Christological part, dealing with Jesus the Lord, the Son of David, the Christ, the Son of God; the glory of the Cross and the Kingdom of God.[1] From the Old Testament prophecies, Irenaeus presents Jesus as the Son of David and the Messiah. In this treatise Irenaeus limits himself to a positive proof of the true doctrine, and so apology has no polemical part.

---

[1] Robinson, op.cit., p. 2. Cf. Quasten, op.cit., p. 292. He writes, "This work is not a catechesis as some scholars thought, but an apologetic treatise as the title suggests." Altaner also seems to agree with them basically: "It is catechetical, edifying, and at the same time apologetic, but avoids any direct polemics and proves the truth of the gospel from O.T. passages." (op.cit., p. 152). Cf. Kelly when he writes, "Of the two treatises which are relevant the Epideixis and the Adversus haereses, the former is a popular, less controversial work, written as a compendium of Christian teaching . . . " (Early Christian Creeds /New York: David McKay Co., 1950/, p. 77).

For the present writing two translations were consulted; one by J. A. Robinson and the other by Joseph P. Smith, S.J. However, all the quotations used in this study come from the latter, which is entitled as the Proof of the Apostolic Preaching. Robinson translated the work under the title of The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching.

Of the other works of Irenaeus we have only a few fragments or titles. Since they are fragmentary and are not used for the present writing, we will omit the presentation of those works.[2]

---

[1] Altaner, op.cit., p. 152.

[2] For the list of those fragments, see ibid., pp. 152-153 and Quasten, op.cit., p. 293.

iv. Theological Structure and Sources

Irenaeus expresses his attitude toward the knowledge of God when he writes,

> A sound mind, and one which does not expose its possessor to danger, and is devoted to piety and the love of truth, will eagerly meditate upon those things which God has placed within the power of mankind, and has subjected to our knowledge, and will make advancement in [acquaintance with] them, rendering the knowledge of them easy to him by means of daily study.[1]

Thus Irenaeus readily recognizes the importance and value of attempting to seek for the knowledge of God. At the same time, however, Irenaeus states that we are destitute of the knowledge of God's mysteries. In a sense he is already giving a hint of the apophatic theology which eventually receives the full attention in the tradition of the Eastern Church, especially in the Cappadocian Fathers. The following passage reflects this idea:

> If, however, we cannot discover explanations of all those things in Scripture which are made the subject of investigation, yet let us not on that account seek after any other God besides Him who really exists. For this is the very greatest impiety. . . .
> but we, inasmuch as we are inferior to and

---

[1] *Against Heresies*, II.27.1, p. 398. [ ] in the original.

> later in existence than, the Word of God and His Spirit, are on that very account destitute of the knowledge of His mysteries.[1]

For Irenaeus, then, the very nature of God and that of man make it impossible for man to attain the perfect knowledge of God. Moreover, the prime importance for Irenaeus was love of God and faith in God rather than the knowledge of God. Thus he writes following St. Paul:

> It is therefore better and more profitable to belong to the simple and unlettered class, and by means of love to attain to nearness to God, then, by imagining ourselves learned and skilful, to be found [among those who are] blasphemous against their own God as the Father. And for this reason Paul exclaimed, "Knowledge puffeth up, but love edifieth:" . . .[2]

Therefore, it is understandable that the theology of Irenaeus is far from being systematic and philosophical. He is more a biblical theologian than a systematic theologian.

---

[1] Against Heresies, II.28.2, p. 399. Cf. Harnack, op.cit., p. 233. He writes, "Irenaeus uttered most urgent warnings against subtle speculations; but yet, in the naivest way, associated with the faithfully preserved traditional doctrines and fancies of the faith theories which he likewise regarded as tradition and which, in point of form, did not differ from those of the Apologists or Gnostics."

[2] Against Heresies, II.26.1, p. 397. [ ] in the original.

The most important source for his theology is the Scripture. He quotes rather extensively both from the Old and the New Testament. Then his thorough acquaintance with the ecclesiastical tradition offered him another excellent source for his theology. In fact, the Bible and tradition are never separated; they are an inter-related whole.[1] Thus we can once again affirm that Irenaeus is the dogmatic theologian who spoke for the Church and from the Church.

His treatise Against Heresies obviously demonstrates that Irenaeus used a number of the Gnostic treatises, but he also made use of older anti-heretical writers. He was familiar with the work of Papias,[2] Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch, Polycarp, Pastor Hermae, Hegesippus, etc.[3]

According to F. Loofs, the writings of bishop Theophilus of Antioch were one of the most important sources of Irenaeus.[4]

---

[1] See Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, pp. 38-39.

[2] Eusebius points out that Irenaeus makes mention of Papias' works. (op.cit., III.39, p. 170). Irenaeus also mentions Papias in Against Heresies. (V.33.4, p. 563).

[3] Altaner, op.cit., p. 151.

[4] F. Loofs, Theophilus von Antiochien Adversus Marcionem und die anderen theologischen Quellen bei Irenaeus (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1930).

Unfortunately, however, two treatises by Theophilus, Against Hermogenes and Against Marcion are no longer extant. Even then Loofs establishes parallels between the writings of Irenaeus and Theophilus' Discourse to Autolycus, which we have today. A general opinion of the scholars as to Loofs' thesis seems to be reflected in Hitchcock's conclusion of his article, "Loofs' Theory of Theophilus of Antioch as a Source of Irenaeus." He writes,

> We have now tried Loofs' twenty nine passages and many others assigned to his source I Q T by a threefold test: scriptual quotations, Irenaean phrases, and passages, principally in the earlier controversial books, passed over by Loofs or allowed by him to be the work of Irenaeus. Passages of this kind are adduced throughout the article, and form the chief foundation of its argument. The conclusion of our study of this monumental work is that Irenaeus has lost nothing by the process and that Loofs' theory is not proven.[1]

---

[1] F. R. M. Hitchcock, "Loofs' Theory of Theophilus of Antioch as a Source of Irenaeus," The Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. 38 (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1937), p. 266. Cf. Altaner, op.cit., p. 151 and Quasten, op.cit., p. 290. They are both in agreement with Hitchcock.

CHAPTER III

THE CREATION OF MAN

1. God the Creator and His Two Hands

The central thesis of Irenaeus' anthropology is that man is a theological being whose origin, nature, and goal are all in God. Thus we have to start from God the Creator instead of starting from man, in order to study the doctrine of man in Irenaeus.

In antithesis to Gnostic theories Irenaeus asserts that man was created by God Himself who is the only Creator. The Gnostic pessimism in regard to the world separates God from the world and leads to dualism that makes a distinction between a supreme God and a Demiurge. Over against this, Irenaeus insists on One God the Creator. He writes,

> It is proper, then, that I should begin with the first and most important head, that is, God the Creator, who made the heaven and earth, and all things that are therein (whom these men blasphemously style the fruit of a defect), and to demonstrate that there is nothing either above Him or after Him; nor

> that, influenced by any one, but of His own free will, He created all things, since He is the Only God, the only Lord, the only Creator, the only Father, alone containing all things, and Himself commanding all things into existence.[1]

While asserting that there is only one God the Creator who is the only Lord of all, Irenaeus strongly rejects both the theory of formation, according to which God had fashioned the world out of matter that pre-existed independently and the theory of emanation, according to which God made the world out of Himself.

Irenaeus defends the true biblical doctrine of creation, creation *ex nihilo*. The doctrine of creation out of nothing not only rejects the theory of formation but also directly points to the almighty power of God the Creator. In the second book, chapter 10 of *Against Heresies*, when Irenaeus expounds that "God created all things out of nothing, and not from pre-existent matter,"[2] he writes,

> While men, indeed, cannot make anything out of nothing, but only out of matter already existing, yet God is in this point

---

[1] *Against Heresies*, II.1.1, p. 359.

[2] *Ibid.*, II.10, p. 369.

> preeminently superior to men, that He Himself called into being the substance of His creation, when previously it had no existence. . . . For, to attribute the substance of created things to the power and will of Him who is God of all, is worthy both of credit and acceptance. It is also agreeable (to reason), and there may be well said regarding such a belief, that "things which are impossible with men are possible with God."[1]

Thus creation _ex nihilo_ points to the fact that nothing is impossible with God and it requires from men not a truth of a philosophical order, but faith in God.

Irenaeus also asserts the unity of the uncreated nature of God over against the system of emanation characteristic of Gnosticism. According to Irenaeus, creation is not a kind of diffusion of the Godhead, that is, creation was not due to some necessity of the divine nature.

Thus creation does not have any ontological foundation in the divine essence. Irenaeus stresses the fact that God was under no necessity of creating anything for Himself because He is sufficient for Himself. Along with this idea, we have to note the fundamental importance of the distinction between the created and uncreated orders in the thought of Irenaeus. He writes,

---

[1] _Against Heresies_, II.10.4, p. 370.

> But the things established are distinct from Him who has established them, and what have been made from Him who has made them. For He is Himself uncreated, both without beginning and end, and lacking nothing. He is Himself sufficient for Himself; and still further, He grants to all others this very beginning, existence; but the things which have been made by Him have received a beginning.[1]

Thus the created things are subject to and stand in need of the Creator to whom they owe their very existence, while the Creator Himself stands in need of nothing. The very fact that the created things have beginning presupposes a change, for the creation itself was a change from non-being into being, while God alone remains the same. This thought is well expressed when Irenaeus writes

> . . . let them learn that God alone, who is Lord of all, is without beginning and without end, being truly and forever the same, and always remaining the same unchangeable. But all things which proceed from Him, whatsoever have been made, and are made, do indeed receive their own beginning of generation, and on this account are inferior to Him who formed them, inasmuch as they are not begotten. Nevertheless

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.8.3, p. 422.

> they endure and extend their existence into a long series of ages in accordance with the will of God their Creator; so that He grants them that they should be thus formed at the beginning, and that they should so exist afterwards.[1]

The basic difference between the created things and the uncreated makes it impossible for the creature to describe or conceive God in the full sense. In other words, God cannot be known to man fully because of His superiority. However, this does not mean that He is completely unknown; He is known on account of His providence.[2] Thus it is important to consider the scope and manner of God's providential ordering, which the Fathers called "economy"(οἰκονομία). To the conception of "economy" we must come back later.

Once we accept that the divine nature did not stand under necessity of creation, we must ask where the sole foundation of creation can be found. Irenaeus maintains that creation is from God's free act and a work of His will.

> He, as soon as He thinks, also performs what He has willed; and as soon as He wills,

---

[1] Against Heresies, II.34.2, p. 411.

[2] Ibid., II.2.4, p. 361 and II.6.1, p. 365.

> also thinks that which He has willed; then thinking when He wills, and then willing when He thinks, since He is all thought, (all will, all mind, all light), all eye, all ear, the entire foundation of all good things.[1]

On this basis Irenaeus can also indicate the impossibility of the Gnostic belief that there is a Creator God and a Supreme God. The same God who formed a conception in His Mind should produce the things which had been conceived in His Mind. Then it becomes impossible for the Gnostics to affirm that the world was made by any other god than God the Creator in Whom the mental conception and the actual production are not separated.[2]

While Irenaeus rejects any possibility of lapse within the Godhead to safeguard the unity of God, he frequently discusses "God the Creator and His Two Hands." In his writings, Irenaeus uses a synthetic figure, "the Divine Hands" as a safeguard to the divine unity when he explicates the Trinity working at creation.

Irenaeus interchangeably uses terms such as "the Word and Wisdom" and "Son and the Spirit" and he often describes them as "the Hands of God" which were always present with the Creator God. The divine Hands were active in the creation.

---

[1] Against Heresies, I.12.2, p. 333.

[2] Ibid., II.3.2, p. 362.

> For with Him were always present the Word and Wisdom, and Son and the Spirit, by whom and in whom, freely and spontaneously, He made all things, to whom also He speaks, "Let Us make man after Our image and likeness;" . . .[1]
>
> And therefore throughout all time, man having been moulded at the beginning by the hands of God, that is, of the Son and of the Spirit, is made after the image and likeness of God: . . .[2]

God did not require angels to assist Him in creation or any other power inferior to Himself, but He created everything by His Word and Spirit.[3]

It is not easy to distinguish the role of the Word and the Spirit at creation. In the Old Testament it was already taught that God created the world by His Wisdom, foreshadowing the Logos of St. John.[4] Both Justin and

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.20.1, pp. 487-488.

[2] Ibid., V.28.4, p. 557.

[3] Ibid., II.2.4, p. 361, IV.7.4, p. 470.

[4] Ps. 104:24, Jer. 10:12, Jer. 51:15, Pro. 8:22-36.

Origen identified the personified Wisdom of God with the Son.[1] In the writings of Irenaeus, however, we find that he often identifies the Spirit with the Wisdom of God, and the Word with the Son without whom the entire creation was impossible.[2]

In antiquity, the term *Logos* is a key concept in both Jewish and pagan thought. The concept of the Word of God as an almost personal agent in creating and sustaining the world was obviously rooted in Judaism.

---

[1] Justin writes, "'I shall give you another testimony, my friends,' said I, 'from the Scriptures, that God begat before all creatures a Beginning, [who was] a certain rational power [proceeding] from Himself, who is called by the Holy Spirit, now the glory of the Lord, now the Son, again Wisdom, again an Angel, then God, and then Lord and Logos;...." ("Dialogue with Trypho," *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. I, ed. by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson [Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company,1885], LXI, p. 227). Origen also writes, "Whatever, therefore, we have predicated of the Wisdom of God, will be appropriately applied and understood of the Son of God, in virtue of His being the Life, and the Word, and the Truth, and the Resurrection:..." ("De Principiis," *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. IV, trans. by Frederick Crombie, II.4, p. 247).

[2] Irenaeus of Lyons, *Proof of the Apostolic Preaching*, Ancient Christian Writers, No. 16, trans. by Joseph P. Smith (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1952), 5, p. 50.

Even though we find a number of the Old Testament texts in which the Word is presented primarily as a spoken word of God to the patriarchs or the prophets, it is also used in the sense of the Creator Word.[1] Then in post-exilic Judaism, the personified Wisdom became to be identified with the Word of God through which God has dealings with the world.

In pagan antiquity it was Stoics who took over the concept of Logos as universal reason governing and permeating the world. Then we find Philo in whom the connection between this philosophical understanding of the Logos and the Biblical conception was made. Philo took the passages of the Old Testament where the Logos is signified as the act of creation and connected them with the philosophical concept of the Logos.

In fact Logos is the corner stone of Philo's system. Philo combined the Jewish conceptions of the Wisdom and the creative Word of God, the Platonic doctrine of ideas, and the Stoic thought of the divine reason operating in the world. Then under the already known and conveniently elastic name of the *Logos*, Philo posited a mediatorial hypostasis between God and the world.

---

[1] Ps. 33:6, 9, 119:89, 147:18, 148:8.

The *Logos* is the Wisdom of God in the sense that it is the expressed thought of the divine mind, but to the cosmos he is related as architect and instrument. Thus *Logos* underlines the distinction between God and the world on the one hand and the bond of union between them on the other. Likewise because he is a partaker alike of the divine and human nature, He mediates between God and man.

As a Jewish theologian, Philo was able to find in the *Logos* the personal mediator of divine revelation, but as a Greek philosopher he presented the *Logos* as merely an impersonal principle, or property of God, at work in the world, and as the divine principle of virtue in the human soul.[1]

When John introduced the *Logos* conception, he was only using the Greek term *Logos* instead of the Hebrew term Wisdom.

---

[1] Cf. Harry Austryn Wolfson, *Philo*, Vol. I (Cambridge· Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1947), pp. 253-261.

Among the Christian Apologists we find Justin developing the idea of the Logos in creation. For him the generation of the Logos is linked with the creation of the world. In other words, Justin held that the Logos was generated by an act of will of the Father with a view to creation. In this sense, then, the Logos is understood as the mediator between God the Father and the world. God creates and reveals Himself exclusively through the Logos, but the Logos appears as the envoy of the supreme God rather than the Son of God, equal and consubstantial with the Father. Thus when Justin discusses the relation between the Logos and the Father, he tends to subordinationism.[1] At the same time, there is not enough distinction between the Logos in Christ and in man. In Christ the divine Logos appeared in its fulness; nevertheless, every man possesses a germ of the Logos in his reason.[2]

Origen follows the similar line of thought with Justin in his understanding of the Logos. According to him, the *Logos* is inferior to the Father and superior to the *logikoi*, because the *Logos* is entirely dependent on the Father while the other *logikoi* are dependent on the *Logos*. The *Logos* is an intermediary between God and the multiplicity of the world. Thus between absolute unity and the multiplicity of creatures, the *Logos* is a being who is one and yet shares in the multiplicity. Origen, too, made an error of subordinationism by putting theology into the mould of Middle Platonism. In Origen, the Son merely shares in the Godhead instead of possessing it absolutely and not much distinction can be found between the *Logos* and the *logikoi*.

---

[1] Justin Martyr, "The Second Apology," The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. I, VI, p. 190.

[2] Ibid., X, p. 191, XIII, p. 192.

Irenaeus was in advance of these persons in his firmer grasp and more explicit statement of the notion of "economy,"[1] and as Kelly points out, in the much fuller recognition which he gave to the place of the Spirit in the triadic scheme.[1] When Irenaeus talks about God the Creator and His Two Hands in creation, he already expresses the economical manifestation of the Trinity. In fact, that is why Irenaeus calls the Son and the Spirit "the Two Hands." The doctrine of "the Two Hands" represents the immediate action by the whole Godhead, and consequently equality between the Son and the Spirit who are very God at work in the world. The Trinity consulted within itself before creating, which became a work.

---

[1] The term, "economy"(οικονομια) has a very wide range of meaning. For a detailed analysis of the term, see G. L. Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought* (London: S. P. C. K., 1959), PP. 57-67. "Enough has been said to indicate the extent to which the Greek Fathers recognized, in principle and in detail, the providential activity of God in nature, human history, and the sphere of grace. It need only be added that the supreme instance of divine economy, whether in the sense of dispensation, condescension or special providence, was exhibited in the Incarnation, for which the word 'oekonomia,' without any verbal qualification is the regular patristic term from the third century onward." (P. 67).

Often Irenaeus talks about creation by the Word and creation by the Spirit in the same sense. Obviously, Irenaeus finds difficulty in drawing a clear distinction between the functions of the Word and the Spirit. This becomes evident in Chapter 5 of the Proof of the Apostolic Preaching. The passage must be given in full in order to prove our point and pay our full attention to his discussion on "the Trinity and Creatures."

> In this way, then, there is declared one God, the Father, uncreated, invisible, maker of all things, above whom there is no other God. And God is rational, and

---

[1] Kelly, op.cit., p. 105.

> therefore produced creatures by His Word, and God is a spirit, and so fashioned everything by His Spirit, as the prophet also says: by the word of the Lord the heavens were established, and all the power of them by His Spirit. Hence, since the Word "establishes," that is, works bodily and consolidates being, while the Spirit disposes and shapes the various "powers," so the Word is fitly and properly called the Son, but the Spirit the Wisdom of God. Hence too His apostle Paul well says: one God, the Father, who is above all and with all and in us all; for "above all" is the Father, but "with all" is the Word, since it is through Him that everything was made by the Father, and "in us all" is the Spirit, who cries: Abba, Father, and has formed man to the likeness of God. So the Spirit manifests the Word, and therefore the prophets announced the Son of God, but the Word articulates the Spirit, and therefore it is Himself who gives their message to the prophets, and takes up man and brings him to the Father.[1]

When we look into other writings of Irenaeus and relate this passage with them[2], it becomes evident that Irenaeus moved a long way from Justin who does not connect the Holy Spirit with the work of creation. Moreover, Irenaeus boldly identifies the Spirit with the Wisdom for the purpose of asserting the part of the Spirit in creation. His description of the Word and the Spirit as "the Two Hands of God" affirms the equivalence of the Son and the Spirit in creative function.

---

[1] _Proof of the Apostolic Preaching_, 5, pp. 50-51.

[2] There are a number of passages in which Irenaeus discusses the Word and the Spirit in Book IV and V of _Against Heresies_. _supra_, p. 72.

The economy of the Word and the Spirit and their inter-relationship will be dealt with more in detail as we discuss the doctrine of creation in relation to soteriology.[1] At this point of our discussion, however, it seems to be still necessary to elaborate a little more about the Word of God.

We have already seen that Philo and Justin before Irenaeus and Origen after him have attempted to make use of the *Logos* doctrine in their speculation, but Irenaeus pointed out the dangers of going into too detailed a speculation. Furthermore, he is definitely in advance of them in his identity of the Word with the Father and the co-existence of the Word with the Father from all eternity. At the same time Irenaeus already indicates the inseparable relationship between the Christian *Logos* conception and the whole doctrine of redemption. He writes,

---

[1] *Infra*, pp. 242-254.

> ...that there is one Almighty God, who made all things by His Word, both visible and invisible; showing at the same time, that by the Word, through whom God made the creation, He also bestowed salvation on the men included in the creation;...[1]

Following the line of Irenaeus' thought, Athanasius is going to be among the first to give a comprehensive and completely satisfactory presentation of the Christian *Logos* conception, linking it up with the whole doctrine of salvation.[2] In fact, we can say that Irenaeus foreshadows Nicene faith, because he already maintained the co-equality and co-eternity of the Son with the Father. Moreover, he clearly states the position that will become the Nicene epistemology: that is, the knowledge of God can be attained by revelation of God. This is clearly expressed when he writes,

---

[1] *Against Heresies*, III.11.1, p. 426.

[2] Athanasius writes, "It is, then, proper for us to begin the treatment of this subject by speaking of the creation of the universe, and of God its Artificer, that so it may be duly perceived that the renewal of creation has been the work of the selfsame Word that made it at the beginning. For it will appear not inconsonant for the Father to have wrought its salvation in him by whose means he made it." ("On the Incarnation of the Word," *Christology of the Later Fathers,* The Library of Christian Classics, Vol. III, ed. by Edward Rochie Hardy, trans. by Archibald Robertson [Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954], 1, p. 56).

> For the Lord taught us that no man is capable of knowing God, unless he be taught of God; that is, that God cannot be known without God: but that this is the express will of the Father, that God should be known. For they shall know Him to whomsoever the Son has revealed Him.[1]

Man attains the knowledge of God through the Son, "for the Father is the invisible of the Son, but the Son the visible of the Father."[2] It is the Son alone who declares the Father to us, and at the same time "it is the Father alone who knows His own Word."[3]

Irenaeus repeatedly emphasizes that God cannot be known as regards to His greatness, "but as regards His love, He is always known through Him by whose means He ordained all things."[4] Then in the thought of Irenaeus we can already discern the starting point of distinguishing the inner life of God and the way He manifests Himself to men. We find passages where it is hinted that the knowledge of God which we can attain is never the essence of God, but energy. The following passages affirm this point:

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.6.4, p. 468.

[2] Ibid., IV.6.6, p. 469.

[3] Ibid., IV.6.3, p. 468.

[4] Ibid., IV.20.4, p. 488.

> . . . because, through His love and infinite benignity, He has come within reach of human knowledge (knowledge, however, not with regard to His greatness, or with regard to His essence--for that has no man measured or handled--but after this sort: that we should know that He who made, and formed, and breathed in them the breath of life, and nourishes us by means of the creation, establishing all things by His Word, and binding them together by His Wisdom--this is He who is the only true God); . . .[1]

The essence of God is only known to the Holy Trinity and the matter of operation in the Godhead is altogether indescribable. He writes,

> If any one, therefore, says to us, "How then was the Son produced by the Father?" we reply to him, that no man understands that production, or generation, or calling, or revelation, or by whatever name one may describe His generation, which is in fact altogether indescribable.[2]

Thus we can say that the very name of the Word attributed to the Son is itself primarily a designation of the "economic order" proper to the second hypostasis as manifesting the Father.[3]

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.24.2, pp. 458-459.

[2] Ibid., II.28.6, p. 401.

[3] For the teaching of the Fathers as to essence and energies of the Trinity, see Vladimir Lossky, The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church (London: James Clarke & Co., 1957), p. 84.

In conclusion, Irenaeus makes it very clear that there is only One God the Creator who creates everything with His Two Hands, the Word and the Spirit. God the Creator created man with His Two Hands and so we find the origin of man in God. Our next task is to examine the nature of man in terms of his relation to God and to the entire creation when God first created man.

2. Image and Likeness

In the first section of this chapter we have dealt with the Triune God who created the entire universe including man. Now we must discuss the creation of man in more specific terms. That which distinguishes the creation of man from the rest of God's creation lies in the fact that God created man in His "image and likeness." One of the most important and controversial problems in Irenaeus' anthropology is, in fact, his interpretation of this "image and likeness."

The combination of these two words, image and likeness, occurs in a very large number of places in Irenaeus' writings. We find both image and likeness mentioned together in Genesis 1:26. These words are rendered in Hebrew as צֶלֶם (zãlem) and דְמוּת (Demuth). In the texts of Irenaeus' writings these words are rendered in Greek as εἰκών and ὁμοίωσις, and in Latin as imago and similitudo.

The Greek word εἰκών is used to mean an image, figure, or sometimes likeness. The word, ὁμοίωσις, simply means likeness. In Latin, imago has various meanings such as imitation, copy, image, representation, and likeness. Similitudo is used for likeness, resemblance, or bearing a very close resemblance.

Certainly Genesis 1:26 is used extensively in the writings of Irenaeus; he makes repeated allusions to this verse in reference to the creation of man and man's relation to Christ, and vice versa. It is of great importance to examine how Irenaeus uses these two words. As it was already stated, he uses the combination of the words in a number of places and other times he uses only one of the words. In many places he makes a distinction between the two words.

It is a general consensus of the interpreters of Irenaeus' anthropology that there is a definite distinction in the meaning of these two words, image and likeness.[1] On the other hand, however, there are scholars who maintain that it was a mistake to see a distinction in Irenaeus' understanding of image and likeness. For instance, Gustaf Wingren rejects this distinction very vigorously when he indicates the fallacy of distinguishing between natural and supernatural as the basis of our thinking. He writes,

---

[1] Ernst Klebba, in his book, *Die Anthropologie Des Hl. Irenaeus*, clearly states that Irenaeus makes a distinction between image and likeness; see, e.g., pp. 23-33 (Munster: Verlag von Heinrich Schoningh, 1894). Also see Emil Brunner, *Man in Revolt* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1939), p. 93. David Cairns also sees a definite distinction in the meaning of image and likeness in the thought of Irenaeus: see, e.g., *The Image of God in Man* (London: SCM Press LTD, 1953), pp. 74-83. Reinhold Niebuhr also writes, "This fact prompted Irenaeus to distingusih between the image and likeness of God upon the basis of Genesis 1:26, a distinction which persisted in Christian tradition until the Reformation questioned its exegetical validity. According to Irenaeus the Fall destroyed the likeness but not the image of God....Luther was quite right in rejecting the theory from the standpoint of exegesis. The original text: 'Let us make man in our image and likeness,' represents no more than a common Hebraic parallelism. It certainly does not justify the later Catholic distinction between the *pura naturalia* and a *donum supernaturale*, the latter a special gift which God gave to man in addition to his natural endowment, a distinction which was reared upon Irenaeus' original differentiation." (*The Nature and Destiny of of Man*, Vol. 1 [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949], p. 270).

> As soon as we make the distinction between natural and supernatural the basis of our thinking, human and divine will be sharply divided, and the somewhat naive transitions from body to Spirit, which are characteristic of Irenaeus, will be lost. We can see a typical illustration of such a misrepresentation of Irenaeus in the dogmatic historians who refuse to see _imago_ and _similitudo_ as constituting a unity, and instead attempt to give the term _imago_ one meaning and _similitudo_ another. Irenaeus speaks of "_imago_ et _similitudo_" in an overwhelming number of expressions as constituting a unity. Were there not a scholastic tradition of medieval origin which separated _imago_ and _similitudo_ into two distinct concepts, no theologian today would have thought of separating these two terms in Irenaeus.[1]

It is one thing to say that Irenaeus was wrong in making a distinction between the meanings of these two words. It is quite another thing to say that Irenaeus did not make a distinction, because one thinks it is a wrong distinction. In any case, however, it seems to be very difficult to decide which is right, because we can find passages that can support both cases, especially when they are taken individually for the purpose of defending a certain position. When dealing with the writings of Irenaeus, this kind of difficulty often arises due to the fact that Irenaeus did not write a systematic theology. Thus at the present stage of our discussion, it might be sufficient to state this problem as a prologomenon to our study of Irenaeus' understanding of "image and likeness" and we will proceed with our analysis of his use of "image and likeness."

---

[1] Gustaf Wingren, _Man and the Incarnation_ (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959), p. 157.

i. Body, Soul, and Spirit

Perhaps one of the clues in understanding the anthropology of Irenaeus is to explicate his exposition of human nature as trichotomy instead of dichotomy. And one of the keys of understanding his "image and likeness" conception is to relate the trichotomy in Irenaeus to image and likeness.

Irenaeus describes human nature as threefold: consisting of spirit, soul and body. In the fifth book of Against Heresies he strongly emphasizes that man is not only possessed with body and soul but also with the spirit.

> They do not take this fact into consideration, that there are three things out of which, as I have shown, the complete man is composed--flesh, soul, and spirit. One of these does indeed preserve and fashion [the man]--this is the spirit; while as to another it is united and formed--that is the flesh; then [comes] that which is between these two--that is the soul, which sometimes indeed, when it follows the spirit, is raised by it, but sometimes it sympathizes with the flesh, and falls into carnal lusts.[1]

In this passage, the spirit is described as preserving and fashioning the man. Therefore, we can hardly say that the spirit is something added to man; man cannot be a man without it.

When we discuss the "spirit," however, the chief difficulty arises from the fact that at times Irenaeus seems to identify the spirit of man with the Spirit of God. In a number of passages Irenaeus equates "the image of God" with the body and soul, and the "likeness" with the Spirit. We find a good example of it in the following passage:

> But when the spirit here blended with the soul is united to [God's] handiwork, the man is rendered spiritual and perfect because of the outpouring of the Spirit, and this is he who was made in the image and likeness of God. But if the Spirit be wanting

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.9.1, p. 534. [ ] in the original.

> to the soul, he who is such is indeed of an animal nature, and being left carnal, shall be an imperfect being, possessing indeed the image [of God] in his formation (in plasmate), but not receiving the similitude through the Spirit, and thus is this being imperfect. Thus also, if any one take away the image and set aside the handiwork, he cannot then understand this as being a man, as I have already said, or as something else than a man. For that flesh which has been moulded is not a perfect man in itself, but the body of a man, and part of a man. Neither is the soul itself, considered apart by itself, the man; but it is the soul of a man, and part of a man. Neither is the spirit a man, for it is called spirit, and not a man; but the commingling and union of all these constitutes the perfect man.[1]

Here Irenaeus makes it clear that what constitutes man is flesh, soul, and the spirit, in which case it becomes obvious that he views man as originally possessing not only body and soul but also spirit. We also notice that Irenaeus uses the term, "perfect man" much more in the moral sense than the natural sense.[1] In this case he points to a closer relationship between the spirit of man and the Spirit of God who bestows the perfection of man. It become more obvious when Irenaeus quotes St. Paul's epistle to Thessalonians saying that the apostle made it clear that the saved man is a complete man as well as a spiritual man.[1]

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.6.1, p. 532.

[2] Adolphus Stieren makes a comment in his edition, Sancti Irenaei episcopi Lugdunensis quae supersunt omnia, Vol. 1, "perfectum hominem efficit in genere morali videliccet, non in naturali." (Leipzig: T. O. Weigel, 1853), p. 731.

Proceeding a little further on Irenaeus' trichotomy in relation to his _imago_ and _similitudo_ conception, we must examine the following passage because Irenaeus separates _imago_ and _similitudo_ quite clearly in it.

> Now God shall be glorified in His handiwork, fitting it so as to be comformable to, and modelled after, His own Son. For by the hands of the Father, that is, by the Son and the Holy Spirit, man, and not [merely] a part of man, was made in the likeness of God. Now the soul and the spirit are certainly a part of the man, but certainly not the man; for the perfect man consists in the commingling and the union of the soul receiving the spirit of the Father, and the admixture of that fleshly nature which was moulded after the image of God.[2]

In this passage Irenaeus clearly separates _imago_ from _similitudo_ , perhaps to safeguard the whole man as Gustaf Wingren points out,[1] but at the same time Irenaeus also writes that the fleshly nature was moulded after the image of God. At this point, however, we must see the emphasis which Irenaeus makes on the fact that whole man, not merely a part of man, was made in the likeness of God. In the light of this emphasis, we can affirm that if it is true that the fleshly nature which was moulded after the image of God is a part of man without which man cannot be complete, it is also true that the fleshly nature is not excluded from the likeness of God. In fact, what Irenaeus stresses is that the whole man--body, soul, and spirit--is made in the likeness of God. In this case, we can hardly say that the natural man is made of body and soul and that the spirit which is added to the natural man by the grace of God is supernatural.

---

[1] _Against Heresies_, V.6.1, p. 532.

[2] _Ibid._, V.6.1, p. 531. [ ] in the original.

---

[1] Wingren points out that the interpreters of Irenaes' doctrine of man made a mistake of separating the natural and supernatural on the basis of this passage. He argues that we should take into consideration the situation in which Irenaeus had to separate _imago_ and _similitudo_ lest we should misinterpret him. He writes, "On the other hand, we must frankly admit that in these two passages (V.6.1, V.16.1) Irenaeus does actually separate _imago_ and _similitudo_ in such a way that for the scholar who is confessionally bound, and not historically interested, what he says must lend support to the later Roman Catholic way of thinking. Loofs, _Theophilus von Antiochien_, p. 211 f., without good grounds, regards the distinction between the two terms which emerged in a particular polemical situation as a sign that Irenaeus borrowed from a literary source which can be isolated." (Wingren, _op.cit._, pp. 158-159 footnote). ( ) mine.

Many Roman Catholic scholars see a prime example of separating the nature and supernature in Irenaeus' conception of *imago* and *similitudo*. Vernet writes in his article on Irenaeus in *the Dictionaire de Théologie Catholique*, Vol. 7:

> All men have the same nature.... But man, composed of body and soul, perhaps more body than soul: may be spiritual or pneumatic, that is (to say) divine. In modern terms, the natural life may be completed by the supernatural life. "Our substance that is (to say) the union of soul and body, receiving the Spirit of God, constitutes the spiritual man." The πνεῦμα is not a part of human nature, it is the grace of the Holy Spirit, which deifies man.[1]

It is this kind of identification of "natural and supernatural" with Irenaeus' distinction of *imago* and and *similitudo* in relation to body, soul, and spirit that makes many scholars criticize Irenaeus. For example,

---

[1] F. Vernet, "Irene," *Dictionaire de Théologie Catholique*, Vol. 7 (Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ane, 1922), p. 2454. My translation from French.

Brunner writes in his book, Man in Revolt,

> The first great theologian of the early Catholic Church distinguishes a double element in man: the image of God which consists in the freedom and rationality of his nature, and the likeness of God, which consists in his self-determination according to the divine destiny, in the justitia originalis as a special divine gift, the gift of supernatural communion of God.[1]

Then he goes on and confirms his own belief, saying,

> Man is not a 'two-storey' creature, but--even if now corrupted--a unity. His relation to God is not something which is added to his human nature; it is the core and the ground of his humanitas.[2]

Here, what Brunner thinks to be his own belief as opposed to Irenaeus' exposition of imago and similitudo is exactly what Irenaeus is stressing. In other words, if Irenaeus is saying that a complete man, who consists of body, soul, and spirit, is made in the likeness of God, how can we possibly separate the image of God in man from man's relation to God? In a sense, Irenaeus is denying the same thing which Brunner is so emphatically denying, that is, no part of man can be separated from man's relation to God, because the man as a whole is made in the likeness of God. Here then we might come to a glimpse of a solution of our complicated and confusing problem, the problem of distinguishing imago and similitudo in Irenaeus.

---

[1] Brunner, op.cit., p. 93.

[2] Ibid., p. 94.

Irenaeus does distinguish imago and similitudo. Many passages clearly prove this. In spite of those confusing passages,[1] we agree with those who equate the image of God with the body and soul in man and the spirit with the likeness of God. What seems to be crucial is our re-interpretation of this distinction. Irenaeus separates spirit from body and soul, relating quite definitely spirit to the Spirit of God. Indeed, he often identifies the spirit of man with the Spirit of God. But this identification does not necessarily lead us to base our thinking on what is natural and supernatural, because for Irenaeus the spirit in man (made in the likeness of God) is not something added to human nature. Does not Irenaeus say that a man without spirit possesses an animal nature? Moreover, he describes the spirit as something that forms and preserves man, in which case we cannot possibly conceive of man as such without spirit.

---

[1] In V.6.1 (supra, p. 91), it seems to be clear that Irenaeus equates "likeness" with the "spirit" and in the passage quoted on page 91, there is a specific line which identifies "the image of God" with the "fleshly nature of man." On the other hand, however, Irenaeus sometimes describes the soul as something neutral, that is, as something between the body and the spirit relating one to the other. (See V.9.1). Sometimes Irenaeus uses the soul and the spirit together in distinction from the body and sometimes the body and the soul in distinction from the spirit and sometimes, the body in distinction from the spirit, putting soul somewhere between those two. But the comprehensive reading of his entire writing seems to justify that Irenaeus equates the spirit with the likeness and the body and soul with the image of God.

In conclusion, then, the distinction between the image and likeness should not lead us to say that man can be a natural man without the spirit, hence describing the spirit to be something added to the natural man. It becomes more obvious when we relate this natural and supernatural concept with the grace of God. The fact that man was created by God was a pure grace, to begin with! Then how can we say that the addition of the spirit is the supernature added by the grace of God?[1]

At this point let us summarize our points for a better understanding of Irenaeus' *imago* and *similitudo* concepts in relation to his anthropology. (1) The whole man is made of spirit, body, and soul. Thus the spirit is not an addition, but a part of the whole man, without which man cannot be man at all. (2) The whole of man, not a part of him, was made in the *imago* and *similitudo* of God.[1] (3) Furthermore there is a functional distinction between the spirit on the one hand and the body and soul on the other. In this case the image of God is equated with the body and soul aspect of the trichotomy. The very fact that the body and soul are made in the image of God affirms that the creation of man was due to God's grace. And the spirit is more closely related to the Spirit of God and is equated with the likeness of God.

---

[1] When Lossky writes about the tradition of the Eastern Church in general, we find that his statement is relevant to the position of Irenaeus. He writes, "The idea of supererogatory grace which is added to nature in order to order it towards God is foreign to the tradition of the Eastern Church. As the image of God, the ordering of the human person was towards its Archetype." (Lossky, *op.cit.*, p. 131). Allan D. Galloway also gives a very helpful comparison between medieval concept of the nature and supernature and Irenaeus' position in regard to it. He compares the attitude of Irenaeus to nature and that of Augustine whom he thinks to be the founder of the covert dualism of the Middle Ages. Even though Augustine is prepared to admit the goodness of nature, he also indicates that even the goodness of this world has no significance whatever when we speak in terms of the benefits bestowed in Christ. On the other hand, in Irenaeus there are not two orders of goodness but only one. "All goodness, whether it belongs to this world or to the final consummation, is a manifestation of the grace of God." In the theology of Irenaeus we discern the ultimate unity of nature and grace. Thus the dualism of Middle Ages, sharply developed by Thomas Aquinas is foreign to Irenaeus. (*The Cosmic Christ* [New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1951], p. 127.

(4) It now remains for us to elaborate the third point further as we shall argue that the distinction becomes legitimate in the moral sense rather than in the natural sense. To do more justice to his moral argument we can proceed with our discussion starting from man's

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.6.1, p. 531, V.16.2, p. 544. In V.16.2 Irenaeus states that man as a whole was created in the image of God; this implies that the tripartite of man is all included in the image of God as it was all included in the likeness of God in V.6.1. Then he uses the term similitudo separately as something which was lost. In this case, by relating the spirit of man with similitudo, we grasp one of the basic anthropological aspects of Irenaeus, the idea of growing into perfection.

origin and leading to his goal or final destiny according to the eternal plan of salvation (οἰκονομία).

The distinction between *imago* and *similitudo* in the moral sense is consistent with Irenaeus' concept of "growth," because the image and likeness of God in man is not something inalienable from man's nature which was given at one time and now is static. It exists in man's nature in relation to the Creator and the relation of man to God is supposed to grow by its nature. In this sense, we can say that there is no such thing that is distinctly man's nature, because apart from the Creator who bestows nature to man, it is not nature at all.

It is in this sense that we can argue that to be a man is to be a Christian, because to be a Christian simply means to be a true human being. At this point, we have to emphasize once again that grace is not something specifically given to the Christians only; it is given to every living creature because the very life which is bestowed to the creature comes from God's grace. Man in the image and likeness of God implies man's natural kinship with God.

To elaborate our discussion, let us examine some of the different theories as to what the image of God in man consists. Some Greek Fathers, such as Gregory of Nyssa and John of Damascus, identified the image of God in man with the human free will.[1] Augustine attempted to see the image of God (Trinity) in the rational nature of the soul.[1] Writers of different schools later have agreed that man's image character is principally linked with his soul and not with his body. Within the Alexandrian tradition the image character is related to the soul alone.

---

[1] Gregory of Nyssa, examining the meaning of the creation of man in "image and likeness of God," writes, "Thus there is in us the principle of all excellence, all virtue and wisdom, and every higher thing that we conceive: but pre-eminent among all is the fact that we are free from necessity, and not in bondage to any natural power, but have decision in our own power as we please; for virtue is a voluntary thing, subject to no dominion: that which is the result of compulsion and force cannot be virtue." ("On the Making of Man," The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Series Two, Vol. V, ed. by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, trans. by H. A. Wilson [Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956], XVI, p. 405). John of Damascus writes about the image of God and the freedom of will in this manner: "Now this being the case, He creates with His own hands man of a visible nature and an invisible, after His own image and likeness: on the one hand man's body He formed of earth, and on the other his reasoning and thinking soul. He bestowed upon him by His own inbreathing, and this is what we mean by 'after His image.' For the phrase 'after His image' clearly refers to the side of his nature which consists of mind and free will, whereas 'after His likeness' means likeness in virtue so far as that is possible." ("Exposition of the Orthodox Faith," The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Series Two, Vol. IX, trans. by S. D. F. Salmond, XII, pp. 30-31). The emphasis on human freedom in relation to the image character seems to be more apparent in the Eastern Fathers.

In Irenaeus, too, we see that man's freedom and rationality are a dominant part of the image of God which cannot be lost by sin. In fact, most of the interpreters of Irenaeus' anthropology seem to agree that for Irenaeus the image of God is summed up in his nature as a rational and free being.

On the other hand, there is another element on which Irenaeus lays stress in discussing the image of God in man. This is the body. In other words, we notice that in Irenaeus the image has a strongly physical emphasis as well. There are some scholars like H. W. Robinson who indicate that Irenaeus assigns the image of God, in the sense of physical resemblance, to the imperfect or carnal man, while reserving the likeness for the man made perfect through the Spirit of God.[1] By laying emphasis on the body to be the image of God, however, Irenaeus is in fact stressing the unity of man.[2]

---

[1] Augustine explicitly states that the image is the "image of the Trinity," in his writing "On the Trinity." (*The Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers*, Series One, Vol. III [~~Michigan:~~ Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956], VII.6.12, p. 113). He also gives his view on the image of God in the same writing in Book XIV, chapter 4: "The image of God is to be sought in the immortality of the rational soul." (p. 185).

In accordance with many other scholars, David Cairns interprets Irenaeus as following:

> For Irenaeus the image in man is, as we have seen, linked in its two aspects to the psycho-physical nature, body and soul. 'Soul' here includes man's power of freedom and his reason. In the Christian believer there is a third element, the indwelling Spirit of God. This divine principle is not part of man's nature, but is a supernatural gift of God. Thus believers have three components in their being, the body, or handiwork of God, the soul and the spirit.[3]

---

[1] H. Wheeler Robinson, The Christian Doctrine of Man (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911), p. 165.

[2] Irenaeus would essentially agree with Dietrich Bonhoeffer when he says that "To live as man means to live as body in Spirit. Escape from the body is escape from being man and escape from the spirit as well. Body is the existnece form of the spirit, as spirit is the existnece form of body." (Creation and Fall /SCM Press, 1959/, pp. 45-46).

[3] Cairns, op.cit., pp. 78-79.

After interpreting the image concept in Irenaeus this way, many scholars attempt to demonstrate a definite influence of Gnosticism and of general Greek philosophy on Irenaeus' trichotomy. An example of this can be found in Brunner's statement:

> His anthropology is Gnosticism purified by Scripture, with a strong element of general Greek philosophy. The first and important point, and indeed the decisive element in his doctrine, is the conception of *Imago Dei* as man's natural endowment of reason. For Irenaeus certainly God Himself is Reason proper, hence the rational nature of man is a *participatio Dei*. But Irenaeus is too much of a Christian and a Biblical theologian to be satisfied with this rationalistic idea of the *Imago*. Hence he combines it with a second idea, which in connection with Gen. i.26 (although in complete distortion of the meaning of the passage), as *Similitudo* (ὁμοίωσις) he sets over against the *Imago* (εἰκών).[1]

The possible influence of Gnosticism and Greek philosophy on Irenaeus is also indicated in Otto Reimherr's dissertation, entitled, "Irenaeus and the Doctrine of Creation in Second Century Christianity." He is convinced that Irenaeus was influenced by Philo and Stoicism in saying that man is basically a reasoning being and he is capable of communion with God. He also maintains that Irenaeus used the method of argument familiar to the Gnostics when he contrasted the image of God with the likeness of God.[1]

---

[1] Brunner, *op.cit.*, pp. 504-505. Also see James D. Smart, *The Interpretation of Scripture* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961), p. 149. He sounds like an echo of this position.

We notice, however, that there is a basic difference between the Gnostic triad and that of Irenaeus. The Gnostic triad, flesh, soul, and spirit is made to emphasize that it is only spirit that belongs to the extra-mundane. (According to the Gnostics, reduced to ultimate principles, man's origin is twofold: mundane and extra-mundane). In the Gnostic system, the unity of man in Irenaeus' sense has broken asunder, because the Gnostic man stands in a desperate conflict between spirit and flesh. In fact, it is Gnosticism that used a biblical text to a metaphysical frame in the realm of anthropology. Samuel Laeuchli gives an excellent explanation for this:

> Adam is the offspring of the marriage between pleroma and eloim, a product of two conflicting forces, on the borderline between pleroma and creation (Exc. ex Theod. 41.4; Hipp. Ref. V.26.8; 26.23). The body

---

[1] Otto Reimherr, "Irenaeus and the Doctrine of Creation in Second Century Christianity," Columbia University Dissertation, 1957, pp. 49-50.

> of Adam is formed from evil matter. The creation of the woman is the emanation of ennoia from the first man (Apocr. Joh. 59-60). All three examples use biblical metaphors to demonstrate anthropological facts: exegesis as the presentation of an anthropology. Interpretation is in reality the elaboration of a metaphysical concept of "man" with the tools of biblical language.[1]

The anthropological dualism of Gnosticism is led to the contempt for the body as "the prison," which Irenaeus so vigorously rejects.[2] Furthermore the pneuma in their system which is equated with the likeness in Irenaeus' thought is basically different from the spirit of man. Hans Jonas describes the pneuma in Gnosticism:

> In its unredeemed state the pneuma thus immersed in soul and flesh is unconscious of itself, benumbed, asleep, or intoxicated by the poison of the world: in brief, it is "ignorant." Its awakening and liberation is effected through "knowledge."[3]

In Irenaeus, the perfection of the spirit of man that is made in the likeness of God is through the Spirit of God, but according to the Gnostics, the pneumatic morality is determined by hostility toward the world and contempt for all mundane ties. Furthermore, the liberation of pneuma is not through the Spirit of God but through knowledge which has an ontological position.

---

[1] Laeuchli, op.cit., p. 70.

[2] Against Heresies, I.25.4, p. 351.

[3] Jonas, op.cit., p. 45.

As to the other theories in regard to various influences on Irenaeus' concept of Imago Dei, we can examine the validity of them by way of summarizing our entire discussion on Irenaeus' trichotomy in relation to the image and likeness. For Irenaeus the image of God in man is constituted by the very nature of man as such, and as a creature of God. It is true that the image character is strongly expressed in his nature as a rational and free being, especially in contrast to the rest of the creation. At the same time, however, this is not to say that the image is only in the soul; for Irenaeus the human unity of body and soul is natural and ontological.

Man, however, cannot be a complete being without his spirit, because a personal relationship with God cannot be excluded from human nature, and this relationship is identical with fully realized human existence.

Irenaeus equates the likeness of God with the Spirit to lay stress on the fact that man has to grow through the Spirit of God; without this growth man cannot be a man in a true sense. Man can be fully man only in relation to the Spirit.

This theory would also point to the importance of an individual person, because on this basis we can say that there is a personal aspect in man's life in his relation to God. In other words, man is called to grow and add virtues through his individual relationship with the Spirit to his natural goodness according to the image.

We read a loss of the likeness in Adam at the Fall, which confirms that the likeness of God in man is related to man's spiritual growth through the Spirit. When man sins, man loses his spiritual kinship with the Creator and he becomes unnatural. The full realization of Imago Dei is found only in the man whose likeness is restored in Christ, that is, man in redemption. Then man's nature as such does not exist in alienation from God; it is only in relation with God that the full meaning of man's existence can be found. This is thoroughly biblical.[1]

It is not correct to say that for Irenaeus human spirit would not be a gift universal and common to all mankind. It is a gift universal, but the difference between the believer and the non-believer is that the former stays in relation with the Source of the Spirit whereas the latter separates himself from Him.

ii. Dominion and Freedom of Man

Closely related to the image and likeness is the question of man's dominion and freedom. Dominion in relation to other creatures is clearly recited by Irenaeus in a number of places. Man's dominion over irrational creatures has to do with his freedom as expressed in the image of God. This aspect is well demonstrated when Irenaeus says that

---

[1] James Smart's explanation about the relation between covenant and creation confirms that Irenaeus' understanding of image and likeness as we interpreted it is biblical. He writes, "God created man to be such in his nature that he could enter into the covenant relation, responding to his love with love and reflecting the very holiness of God's own nature. To be created in God's image is therefore to be created for this relation, and to be such in his nature that the fulfillment of the relation is possible." It should be remembered that Smart is a scholar who used Irenaeus' image and likeness concept as an example of the distortion of the biblical passage. (Smart, op.cit., pp. 139-140).

> In the previous books I have set forth the causes for which God permitted these things to be made, and have pointed out that all such have been created for the benefit of that human nature which is saved, ripening for immortality that which is [possessed] of its own free will and its own power, and preparing and rendering it more adapted for eternal subjection to God. And therefore the creation is suited [to the wants] of man; for man was not made for its sake, but creation for the sake of man.[1]

The very right of a human being to dominate the rest of God's creation comes from the fact that he was created in the image of God through which the freedom is given. Only man who is in himself free reflects the power of the Giver of freedom. The reason why man is possessed of free will is because of the fact that God is possessed of free will in whose likeness man was created.[1]

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.29.1, p. 558. [ ] in the original. Cf. Theophilus of Antioch when he writes, "For when God said, 'Let us make man in Our image, after Our likeness,' He first intimates the dignity of man. For God having made all things by His Word, and having reckoned them all mere bye-works, reckons the creation of man to be the only work worthy of His own hands. . . . And when He had made and blessed him, that he might increase and replenish the earth, He put all things under His dominion, and at his service: . . ." ("Theophilus to Autolycus," Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. II, ed. by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson [Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1962], I.18, p. 101).

Man's freedom is, however, basically different from that of God, because it is created freedom; man's freedom has to do with his relationship with God and his neighbor and the other creature whereas God's freedom is freedom of creation. Man's freedom is given by God, but the created freedom of man goes beyond all previous deeds of God. Thus the creation around man is lower than he is and so he ought rule over it rather than be ruled by it. The freedom of man which reflects God's power par excellence brings him dominion over other creation of God.[2]

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.37.4, p. 519. Cf. Bonhoeffer when he writes, "Even in its aliveness the work is dead, because it is an event that has happened, because, while it comes out of freedom, it is itself not free but determined. Only that which is itself free is not dead, is not strange, is not torn away as an event that has happened. Only in something that is itself free, the Creator sees himself." (op.cit., pp. 33-34).

[2] The idea of the dominion of man over other creatures is very strong in other Greek Fathers following Irenaeus. One of them is Gregory of Nyssa. He writes, "...he thus manifests man in the world, to be the beholders of some of the wonders therein, and the lord of others; that by his enjoyment he might have knowledge of the Giver, and by the beauty and majesty of the things he saw might trace out that power of the Maker which is beyond speech and language." Gregory also finds the reason for man's being more precious than all the visible creation in the fact that man was created in the image of God. (Gregory, op.cit., II.1, p. 390).

The important idea that is inseparable from the free will that was given to man is the idea of responsibility, because it is precisely because of the freedom that man is responsible for his own behavior. God wants us to choose good instead of evil but in no way does God coerce us, neither in works nor in faith.[1] Thus writes Irenaeus,

> And not merely in works, but also in faith, has preserved the will of man free and under his own control, saying, "According to thy faith be it unto thee;" thus showing that there is a faith specially belonging to man, since he has an opinion specially his own.[2]

In short what God wants us to do is to obey Him voluntarily and not by compulsion. The goodness given by God has to be preserved by man.[3] It is precisely because of this reason that God can justly punish men according to their choices.[1] Because of this freedom of man, divine punishment receives an ethical character.

---

[1] It is easy to collect from the Greek Patristic writers a long succession of illustrative passages, showing among all varities of doctrines, their recognition of man's essential freedom to accept or reject what God has offered to him--to choose good or evil with their consequences of life or death. From a historical standpoint, we notice the general sympathy of the East with the Pelagian postion.

[2] Against Heresies, IV.37.5, pp. 519-520.

[3] Ibid., IV.37.1, p. 518.

In his teaching of freedom and dominion of man, Irenaeus combatted two prevalent notions at that time, put forth by the Stoics and the Gnostics, that is, the belief in irresistible fate of man, and the belief in the essential in-born difference between the soul of one man and that of another. Because man is endowed with freedom which is a direct expression of God's omnipotence, he is neither governed by the irresistable fate nor by in-born difference from other men. Created in the image and likeness of God, man is possessed with free will and dominion over other creatures.

3. Adam and Christ

i. The Primal Innocence and the Childlike Adam

Now we come to one of the fundamental aspects of Irenaeus' anthropology, because this is the starting point where Irenaeus formulates the idea which was to characterize the Greek as distinct from the Latin Fathers.

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.37.2, p. 519.

We have already discussed that man was created in the image and likeness of God, but we have not adequately dealt with the primal state of the first man, Adam. Directly related to this question, we have to ask if the first man created by God was perfect.

Both in Against Heresies and the Proof of the Apostolic Preaching, Irenaeus declares that man, as God created him, is a child.[1] The Greek word, νήπιος means an infant, or a little child. Used in metaphor, it means childish, untaught, and unskilled.

---

[1] All the scholars who write on Irenaeus are aware of the importance of this concept of the first man as "child." For instance L.S. Thornton writes, "For the long story of mankind is a process of education adapted to the fraility of man's condition; and in unfolding this theme Irenaeus draws a striking threefold parallel in which the divine method of dealing with man is seen to repeat itself. The kernel of the argument is the childlike condition of Adam." (Revelation and the Modern World /London: Dacre Press, 1950/, p. 143). The passages from Irenaeus in which this key word, child, appears will be quoted as we proceed with our discussion. infra, p. 114, & p.115. There are some scholars who think that Irenaeus borrowed this idea from Theophilus of Antioch, e.g., L. George Patterson writes, "As an alternative to this Gnostic explanation of the inferior character of the earlier dealings of God with men, he then expands Theophilus' childhood analogy into an interpretation of history as the process by which man is educated in obedience to the divine will. Created things are by their nature imperfect." ("The Anti-Origenist Theology of Methodius of Olympus," /Columbia University Dissertation, 1958/, p. 225). Cf. Theophilus when he writes, "For there was nothing else in the fruit than only knowledge; but knowledge is good when one uses it discreetly. But Adam, being yet an infant in age, was on this account as yet unable to receive knowledge worthily." (op.cit., I.25, p. 104).

Indeed one of the characteristic aspects of Irenaeus' anthropology is his childhood analogy that the first man was like a child. Irenaeus describes the primal innocence of the childlike Adam and Eve in the following manner:

> And Adam and Eve (for this is the name of the woman) were naked and were not ashamed, for their thoughts were innocent and childlike, and they had no conception or imagination of the sort that is engendered in the soul by evil, through concupiscence, and by lust. For they were then in their integrity, preserving their natural state, for what had been breathed into their frame was the spirit of life; now so long as spirit still remains in proper order and vigour it is without imagination or conception of what is shameful. For this reason they were not shamed, as they kissed each other and embraced with the innocence of childhood.[1]

---

[1] Proof of the Apostolic Preaching, 14, p. 56. Cf. 46, p. 78 and 96, p. 106. In both these passages the term, "child" is used in the ethical sense closely related with law. Also see 15, p. 56. Wingren makes a comment: "From the very first Irenaeus connects life, that is, the physical factor, with the Commandments, the ethical, and continues to do so throughout his thinking. If man were to live in accordance with the Commandments he would continue in the state in which he once was, that is, he would be immortal, for obedience and life belong together." (op.cit., p. 29).

The first man was imperfect in the sense that he was destined to grow into perfection, but perfect in the sense that he was as innocent as a child. Irenaeus faces the problem of "why" God did not create the man perfect from the very beginning. To this question he clearly states his basic idea:

> For as it certainly is in the power of a mother to give strong food to her infant, [but she does not do so], as the child is not yet able to receive more substantial nourishment; so also it was possible for God Himself to have made man perfect from the first, but man could not receive this [perfection] being as yet an infant.[1]

Directly related to the idea that man, being an infant, was not capable of receiving the perfection God could have given him, Irenaeus develops another important idea--that is, the basic difference between the Creator and the created. In the same chapter of his book IV, he writes,

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.38.1, p. 521. The Greek text for the passage in Stieren's edition is as following: "Ὡς οὖν ἡ μὲν μήτηρ δύναται τέλειον παρασχεῖν τῷ βρέφει τὸ ἔμβρωμα, τὸ δὲ ἔτι ἀδυνατεῖ τὴν αὐτοῦ πρεσβυτέραν δέξασθαι τροφήν· οὕτως καὶ ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸς μὲν οἷός τε ἦν παρασχεῖν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τὸ τέλειον, ὁ δὲ +ἄνθρωπος ἀδύνατος λαβεῖν αὐτό· νήπιος γὰρ ἦν." (op.cit., pp. 698-699).

> But created things must be inferior to Him who created them, for the very fact of their later origin; for it was not possible for things recently created to have been uncreated. But so much as they are not uncreated, for this very reason do they come short of the perfect.[1]

It is depicted very clearly that the man cannot be perfect in the sense that God is perfect because of the very nature of his created being. This fundamental difference between the Maker and the creature is emphasized over and over again in the entire theology of Irenaeus. Now we have to move to the concept of "growth" and the perfect image of man in Christ.

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.38.1, p. 521. This idea of the basic difference between the Creator and the creature receives full attention in the later Greek Fathers. For instance, Gregory of Nyssa sees the basic difference between God and man mainly in two aspects. In his own words: "What difference then do we discern between the Divine and that which has been made like to the Divine? We find it in the fact that the former is uncreate, while the latter has its being from creation: and this distinction of property brings with it a train of other properties; for it is very certainly acknowledged that the uncreated nature is also immutable, and always remains the same, while the created nature cannot exist without change; for its very passage from non-existence to existence is a certain motion and change of the non-existent transmuted by the Divine purpose into being." (op.cit., XVI, 11, p. 405).

ii. The Concept of Growth and the Perfect Image of Man in Christ

The very idea of "growth" indicates that the primal state of the first man was not perfect. Parallel with this idea, and basic in Irenaeus' anthropology, is the perfect image of man in Christ, not in Adam, the first man. Irenaeus writes,

> But who else is superior to, and more eminent than, that man who was formed after the likeness of God, except the Son of God, after whose image man was created.[1]

It becomes obvious that the perfect image of man is not found in the first man, Adam, but in Christ. The fundamental idea is that the Word (who in the Incarnation became what we are in order to make us what He is) is the same Word which was operative in the original creation, the one in whose image the first man was made.

The association of anthropology and Christology is very apparent in Irenaeus. The image of God that was imprinted upon Adam was not the perfect image of God; it prefigured the vaster process which began when the Word became flesh, but which will reach its fulfillment only when we all attain unto a full grown man, that is, unto the fullness of Christ.[1] The perfect image of man was, however, already manifested in the Word when God created man. It is not difficult to see a close unity between this point and the concept of child and the concept of growth.

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.33.4, p. 507.

To be sure there is a number of statements in Irenaeus about Christ's work from which we can deduce something about man as he was destined to be in creation.

> Wherefore Luke points out that the pedigree which traces the generation of our Lord back to Adam contains seventy two generations, connecting the end with the beginning, and implying that it is He who has summed up in Himself all nations dispersed from Adam downwards, all languages and generations of men, together with Adam himself. Hence also Adam himself termed by Paul, "the figure of Him that was to come," because the Word, the Maker of all things had formed beforehand for Himself the future dispensation of the human race, connected with the Son of God; God having predestined that the first man should be an animal nature, with this view, that he might be saved by the spiritual One. For inasmuch as He had a pre-existence as a saving Being, it was necessary that what might be saved should

---

[1] Cf. Eph. 4:13. ". . . εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ χρίστου."

> also be called into existence, in order that the Being who saves should not exist in vain.[1]

This passage points directly to the future destiny of the humanity in relation to the redemptive work of Christ. Man is never perfect by himself; he can only become perfect in Christ by the work of Christ.

The perfect image of God in man is never manifested in Adam before his fall, but it was manifested in Christ. Thus Irenaeus writes,

> And then, again, this Word was manifested when the Word of God was made man, assimilating Himself to man, and man to Himself, so that by means of his resemblance to the Son, man might become precious to the Father. For in times long past, it was said that man was created in the image of God, but it was not (actually) shown; for the Word was yet invisible, after whose image man was created.[2]

Because the perfect Adam is not found in Adam himself but in Christ, it is also in Christ and by Christ that the man learns the dispensation of God who made man.

> ...let him reflect that man is infinitely inferior to God; that he has received grace only in part, and is not equal or similiar

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.23.3, p. 455.

[2] Ibid., V.16.2, p. 544.

> to his Maker; and, moreover, that he cannot have experience or form a conception of all things like God;...For thou, o man, art not an uncreated being, nor didst thou always co-exist with God, as did His Word; but now, through His pre-eminent goodness, receiving the beginning of thy creation, thou dost gradually learn from the Word the dispensations of God who made thee.[1]

The notion of Adam as a child and the perfect image of man in Christ rather than in Adam are two ideas that can never be separated, because the maturity of Adam (the child) is realized in Christ. At the same time, the doctrine of creation is inseparably related to the doctrine of redemption, because the perfection of creation is so closely linked with the redemptive work of Christ. Andre Benoit remarks,

> Irenaeus obviously accords such importance to the unity of creation and redemption that he is almost led to accept a rectilinear line of development from the first to the second man and to consider the Logos becoming man at the end of the line as

---

[1] Against Heresies, II.25.3, pp. 396-397. Cf. Ibid., II.28.5, p. 400 where he writes, "But God being all Mind, and all Logos, both speaks exactly what He thinks, and thinks exactly what He speaks. For thought is Logos, and Logos is Mind, and the Mind comprehending all things is the Father Himself." In II.28.4, p. 400 Irenaeus describes man as a compound being whose mental process passes through many stages. Thus he lays down the fundamental psychological distinction between God and man, which makes it impossible for human reason to grasp the unseen, unreaveled and unconditioned.

> the crown and the final goal of human nature.[1]

The creation of man in Christ directly leads us to the universalism, which is well reflected when Gustaf Wingren writes,

> The universal application of the work of Christ and its alteration of the status of the whole of humanity is a quite incomprehensible idea apart from the view of mankind as a unity and the idea of man as having been created and destined for eternity.[2]

This history of Adam will be fulfilled only in the Consummation because the history started with Adam finds its perfection only in Christ in whose image man was created and whose image man can only attain at the end.

To say that man is created in Christ means that man cannot be a man without Christ. Man finds his full identification as a man in Christ, not in Adam. In order to be fully man, man has to grow in Christ to reach his image in its fulness. To say that man is created in Christ also means that man has his life in Christ. Thus, even those who do not believe in Him at the present moment owe their life to Christ and they can only attain the fulness of their life when they recognize Christ in whom their perfect identification as a man can be found.

---

[1] André Benoit, Saint Irenée (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1960), p. 228.

[2] Wingren, op.cit., p. 25.

CHAPTER IV

THE FALL OF MAN--ITS CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES

1. The Devil

Something decisive happened which hindered man's growth toward the fulness of the image and likeness of God in which he was created. That was the Fall of man.

In the Old Testament we have the story of Adam's Fall in Genesis 3 from which various interpretations have been derived by different thinkers. Faced with the problem of "why man fell," we have to ask the question: Was man responsible for his own Fall or was another being or even God responsible for the Fall of man? Generally, theologians have tended to answer that man was responsible, thus evading God's responsibility for man's Fall. In Irenaeus, however, we cannot adequately grapple with the problem of man's Fall without dealing with something other than man or God. That is the Devil.

In the Genesis narrative of the Fall, we find the serpent which deceives and seduces man. Irenaeus is the one who takes the story of the serpent seriously and attempts to locate the real cause of the Fall of man outside of man himself. Directly related to the Fall of man is the problem of evil, because evil enters into human existence with the Fall of man. This is to say that if the real cause of man's Fall is not in man himself, evil does not originate with man, because whatever caused the Fall of man, that is also the cause of evil.

When we attempt to see the origin of evil in man, we are holding the "ethical vision of evil," following the tradition of Augustine, because this leads us to ask the question, "Why do I sin?" But when we take the serpent seriously in regard to the origin of evil and attempt to see the origin of evil outside of man, namely in the Devil, we are holding the view that advocates the "demonic structure of evil."[1]

---

[1] In the article, "The Doctrine of Evil in St. Gregory of Nyssa," A.J. Philippou deals with two contrasting views on the problem of evil held in the Ancient Church. He describes one view as "the ethical vision of evil" expounded in the writings of St. Augustine and the other as "the demonic structure of evil," and he finds its clearest expression in the theology of Gregory of Nyssa. (Studia Patristica IX, Band 94, ed. by F. L. Cross /Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1966/, p. 251). It should be remembered that Gregory stands in the tradition of Irenaeus in his view of the problem of evil.

In the writings of Irenaeus we find many passages which make it very clear that he held the "demonic structure of evil" in contrast to Augustine's view of evil. For instance, we find Irenaeus explaining why God did not put any questions to the serpent whereas He interrogated Adam and Eve when they ate the forbidden fruit, saying,

> But He put no question to the serpent; for He knew that he had been the prime mover in the guilty deed; but He pronounced the curse upon him in the first instance, that it might fall upon man with a mitigated rebuke. For God detested him who had led man astray, but by degrees, and little by little, He showed compassion to him who had been beguiled.[1]

In this passage Irenaeus not only describes the serpent as the "prime mover in the guilty deed" (principem transgressionis factum)[2], but also as someone whom God detests very much because of the fact that he led man astray. Thus while God showed compassion to man who had been beguiled, He pronounced the curse upon the beguiler in the first instance. The curse in its fulness is only for the Devil:

> But the curse in all its fulness fell upon the serpent which had beguiled

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.23.5, p. 457.

[2] Stieren, op.cit., p. 550.

> them. "And God," it is declared, "said to the serpent: Because thou hast done this, cursed art thou above all cattle, and above all beasts of the earth."[1]

Irenaeus also quotes from the sayings of the Lord saying that the Lord also indicated that eternal fire was not originally prepared for man, but "for him who beguiled man and caused him to offend."[2] At the same time, however, we must notice that the punishment is also for the followers of Satan. Contrary to the teachings of the Gnostics who taught that the different levels of the moral attainment were related to the inborn constitution of man, Irenaeus teaches that men can either become wheat of chaff by their works; all are God's children, but they either follow God or the Devil by their works.[3]

The serpent is the real enemy of God who stands in opposition to God's plan from the very beginning. In this case evil does not originate with man but it is something which is pre-existent and causes man to sin. The ultimate origin of evil, then, is found in the Devil. The Devil who opposes God from the beginning continues his demonic activity in history and attempts to take men away from God. Thus writes Irenaeus,

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.23.3, p. 456.

[2] Ibid., III.23.3, p. 456.

[3] Ibid., IV.40.3, p. 524, IV.37.1, p. 518.

> The devil, however, as he is the apostate angel, can only go to this length, as he did at the beginning, (namely) to deceive and lead astray the mind of man into disobeying the commandments of God, and gradually to darken the hearts of those who would endeavor to serve him, to the forgetting of the true God, but to the adoration of himself as God.[1]

In fact, the activity of the Devil which started to oppose the divine will in creation becomes more and more intense in history.[2] Irenaeus describes the Devil as the one "who is never at rest at all" in frustrating God's design.[1] Gustaf Wingren rightly observes that

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.24.3, p. 552. See Stieren op.cit., p. 783.

[2] When Philippou is writing about the problem of evil in Gregory of Nyssa, he recognizes the silence on the subject of devil evident as early as the New Testament and indicates that "the ultimate origin of evil is happily thrown into the background by the more pressing issue of the demonic activity in history (Eph. 4,14; 6,11)." (op.cit., p. 254). Sydney Cave also makes a remark that the author of the Epistle of Barnabas is the only one who mentions the transgression wrought in Eve through the serpent among the Apostolic Fathers. He writes, "In view of the tremendous importance assigned to the Fall by later Christian thinkers it is significant that this is the only passage in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers which makes any reference to the Fall." (The Christian Estimate of Man /London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1944/, p. 63).

> For Irenaeus Satan is a real enemy of the Creator, and the cost of defeating this adversary of God was the blood and death of God's own Son.[2]

In a number of passages, after emphasizing the power of the Devil in strong terms, Irenaeus writes about the Word of God who became man in order to conquer the Devil.

> The Word of God, however, the Maker of all things, conquering him by means of human nature, and showing him to be an apostate, has on the contrary, put him under the power of man.[3]

If the Devil is considered to be the real enemy of God in the thought of Irenaeus, now we must ask whether he advocates dualism. When we consider the doctrine of creation and the doctrine of redemption together, we can safely maintain that the background of the *Christus Victor* idea is dualistic, because we see two lines emerging from the beginning; on the one line we have with God, Jesus Christ and on the other there is the Devil. Man stands somewhere between God and the Devil. This idea is well expressed when Irenaeus writes,

---

[1] *Against Heresies,* V.24.2, p. 552.

[2] Wingren, *op.cit*., p. 39.

[3] *Against Heresies*, V.24.4, p. 553.

> . . . so also from the beginning, did God permit man to be swallowed up by the great whale, who was the author of transgression, not that he should perish altogether when so engulphed; but arranging and preparing the plan of salvation, which was accomplished by the Word, through the sign of Jonah, for those who held the same opinion as Jonah regarding the Lord, and who confessed, and said, "I am a servant of the Lord, I worship the Lord God of heaven, who hath made the sea and the dry land."[1]

In this passage we see two lines; one a line of salvation and the other the line of the Devil which will be swallowed up by Christ.

Sometimes Irenaeus writes as if the whole purpose of the creation of man was for the "saving being" who had a pre-existence.

> For inasmuch as He had a pre-existence as a saving Being, it was necessary that what might be saved should also be

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.20.1, p. 450.

> called into existence, in order that
> the Being who saves should not exist
> in vain.[1]

Thus if the perfect image of man is found in Christ from the very beginning, the victory of man is also found in Christ, not in man himself. From the time of creation Christ exists as the One who will carry a victorious conflict against the Devil which is hostile to His will. In this sense, it is foolish to see the cause of the Fall of the first man in the self-analysis of man, because the real cause is outside of man. In this case the work of Christ can be described as the cosmic drama.[2]

At this point, however, we have to stress that Irenaeus does not give any hint of dualism between God and the Devil in the doctrine of creation. It is only God who creates; the Devil is not able to create and call non-being into being. The Devil can only prey on what God pruduces. The Devil's role was to tempt man so that man will follow him instead of the true Creator, God, through the deception. And the man, being deceived by the Devil, finds himself in the midst of weakness, pain and death. Thus Irenaeus writes,

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.22.3, p. 454. The Latin text in Stieren's edition is as following: "Quum enim praeexsisteret salvans, oportebat et quod salvaretur fieri, uti non vacuum sit salvans." (op.cit., p. 544).

[2] Cf. Ephesians 2:2. Here the energy of sin is connected with Satan who controls "the spirit that now works in the sons of disobedience." Thus human struggle against sin gains cosmic signficance.

> For they died who tasted of the tree; and the serpent is proved a liar and a murderer, as the Lord said of him: "For he is a murderer, from the beginning, and the truth is not in him."[1]

The Devil obviously had the power to tempt man; but the important thing to notice is that the Devil had no right, because the creation belongs to God.

As far as the power of the Devil is concerned, we see a definite tendency towards dualism in the thought of Irenaeus. The opposing power of the Devil is so strong that only Christ was able to defeat it. In fact, the whole theology of Irenaeus is marked by his contrast between God and the Devil from the beginning and the ceaseless conflict between the two powers that is found in the midst of human history.

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.23.2, p. 522. Latin text for the last part of the passage: "Quoniam ab initio homicida est, et in veritate non stetit." (Stieren, op.cit., p. 781).

Who, then, was the Devil? Irenaeus writes of him as the "apostate angel," and the chief reason for the angel's apostasy was his envy for man.

> Just as if any one being an apostate, and seizing in a hostile manner another man's territory, should harass the inhabitants of it, in order that he might claim for himself the glory of a king among those ignorant of his apostasy and robbery; so likewise also the devil, being one among those angels who are placed over the spirit of the air, as the Apostle Paul has declared in his Epistle to the Ephesians, becoming envious of man, was rendered an apostate from the divine law: for envy is a thing foreign to God.[1]

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.24.4, p. 553. Cf. IV.40.3, p. 524, V.24.3, p. 552 and II.23.3, p. 456. John Lawson makes an interesting comment: "The source of sin is not in creation, but is spiritual, i.e. Satan's envy of man." (The Biblical Theology of Saint Irenaeus /London: The Epworth Press, 1948/, p. 203). In the Old Testament Isaiah 14 we have traces of the rebellion and fall of a heavenly being. We also hear the story of the "fallen angel" in the New Testament: Jude 6, II Peter 2:4. We can also trace the story of Satan in Slavonic Enoch. Otto Reimherr brings this out in his dissertation, "When Adam was created, God had, through Michael, commanded all angels to worship Adam as the image of God. Satan refused, and because of his refusal he was denied the privilege of remaining in heaven. He was then so aroused with envy for the lofty status given to man that he retaliated by seducing man into sin. In this way Satan succeeded in undoing the work of God, the creator." (op.cit., p. 201). In this connection, then, Reimherr concludes that the themes which appeared in Jewish literature and the New Testament recurred in the writings of the second century Christians who believed that there must be forces at work opposing God's providential intention for his world. (Ibid., p. 203).

In terms of theodicy, however, when we pursue this issue further in an attempt to find out who the fallen angel was in the thought of Irenaeus, we do not have a very clear-cut answer. This is because of the fact that Irenaeus, unlike the Gnostics, will not raise metaphysical questions. After all the history of salvation (οἰκονομία) will be the legitimate field for his kerygmatic approach to theology. Thus the Devil remains as the "mystery of iniquity." The Devil as the mystery of iniquity deceived and tempted man in order to stand in opposition to God.[1]

If the Devil's temptation was possible because of his power, it was not just, because his tyranny over man was not within his right. Irenaeus contrasts the victory of Christ over the Devil and the apostasy of the Devil to demonstrate that Christ's victory was just, while the Devil had no right to have dominion over men.[1] The following passage embodies this idea clearly:

---

[1] When it comes to the ultimate problem of the Devil, Irenaeus seems to be satisfied to leave it as a "mystery" instead of degrading it to the level of a "problem." Cf. Wingren, op.cit., p. 7.

> And since the apostasy tyrannized over us unjustly, and though we were by nature the property of the omnipotent God, alienated us contrary to nature, rendering us its own disciples, the Word of God, powerful in all things, and not defective with regard to his own justice, did righteously turn against that apostasy, and redeem from it His own property, not by violent means, as the apostasy had obtained dominion over us at the beginning, when it insatiably snatched away what was not its own, but by means of persuasion, as became a God of counsel, who does not use violent means to obtain what He desires; so that neither should justice be infringed upon, nor the ancient handiwork of God go to destruction.[2]

Thus if the Devil is the mystery of iniquity who frustrates God's creation from the beginning by unjust means, the Word of God is the One who restores the creation in a manner consonant to reason since He is only taking back what originally belonged to Him. Aulén writes on this point:

---

[1] Cf. Reinhold Seeberg, Text-Book of the History of Doctrines, Vol. I, trans. by Charles E. Hay (Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society, 1905), p. 129.

[2] Against Heresies, V.1.1, p. 527. Gustaf Aúlen rightly interprets Irenaeus when he writes, "All (the fathers of the church) agree that the devil was rightly and reasonably overcome; the teaching of Irenaeus is typical, that man was created by God to belong to Him, that the devil's dominion over man is a perversion of the right order, that the Creator is one with the Redeemer." (Christus Victor /New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951/, p. 48).

> Therefore it is no more than justice that he should be defeated and driven out. The constant emphasis of Irenaeus on this point is explained by his controversy with Marcion and the Gnostics; in opposition to the doctrine of the creation of the world by the Demiurge, he is jealous to insist that by the fact of his creation man belonged from the beginning to the true God, and that the God of redemption is also the God of creation.[1]

To say that the Devil was powerful enough to tempt man and yet is weak enough to be defeated by God the Redeemer, who will restore His creation by redeeming what was lost by unjust means, implies two things at the same time. On the one hand there is a dualism in terms of an intense conflict between the Devil and God, while on the other hand in terms of creating power and the final victory, there is no dualism, because it is only God who will ultimatley defeat the Evil One.[2]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 27.

[2] Wingren again makes an appropriate remark: "The Devil is continually active, and never gives up his desire to embroil the whole of mankind in warfare and strife, but all that he is able to do by this is to disturb God's government of the world; it is an impossibility for him to get the whole of the created order into his control, for God rules." (op.cit., p. 12).

In conclusion, we can maintain that Irenaeus supports the demonic structure of evil, because for him the Devil is the ultimate cause for the Fall of man by his deception and temptation.[1]

2. Adam's Fall

i. Freedom and Disobedience

(1) Adam's Confusion and Cain's Sin

We have discussed Irenaeus' teaching about the Devil who tempted Adam and concluded that the real cause of Adam's Fall was in the Devil. Nevertheless, it was Adam who fell. To begin with, we have to discuss the state of Adam when he fell. We have already indicated that the first man is described as an infant (νήπιος) in Irenaeus, thus putting down the fundamental principle of a developmental or teleological view of man, because an infant is supposed to grow.

---

[1] Galloway criticizes Irenaeus, saying, "Irenaeus prefers to restrict the work of the Devil to that of tempting the heart of man, rather than as being related to the fallen state of the cosmos as a whole. (5.24) He says of the Devil as a power influencing the course of the world's events..." (*op.cit.*, p. 101).

In the recent book, called Evil and the God of Love, John Hick draws our attention to the fundamental difference between Augustinian and Irenaean types of theodicy. He traces the fundamental difference between Augustine and Irenaeus in their understanding of Adam's pre-fallen state. He writes,

> Instead of the doctrine that man was created finitely perfect and then incomprehensively destroyed his own perfection and plunged into sin and misery, Irenaeus suggests that man was created as an imperfect, immature creature who was to undergo moral development and growth and finally be brought to the perfection intended for him by His Maker. Instead of the fall of Adam being presented, as in the Augustinian tradition, as an utterly malignant and catastrophic event, completely disrupting God's plan, Irenaeus pictures it as something that occurred in the childhood of the race, an understandable lapse due to weakness and immaturity rather than an adult crime full of malice and pregnant with perpetual guilt. And instead of the Augustinian view of life's trials as a divine punishment for Adam's sin, Irenaeus sees our world of mingled good and evil as a divinely appointed environment for man's development towards the perfection that represents the fulfillment of God's good purpose for him.[1]

---

[1] John Hick, Evil and the God of Love (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1966), pp. 220-221.

Thus he opposes Augustine's explanation of Adam's pre-fallen state as an exalted condition of original righteousness, maintaining that "man's first condition is one of primitive simplicity."[1] He argues that once we accept Irenaeus' understanding of the pre-fallen state of Adam, the fall of Adam becomes less catastrophic and the sin of Adam is not as serious as it is in the system of Augustine. Irenaeus then sees the Fall of man as a failure that has multiplied the perils and complicated the route of the journey in which God is seeking to lead mankind.[2]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 209.

[2] Ibid., pp. 290-291. Even though John Hick maintains that the burden of Adam's sin becomes less heavy by saying that Adam was like a child, he does not take the Devil seriously in his entire understanding of theodicy. He writes, "Whereas in the theologically edited myth the serpent has become identified with Satan, the arch-enemy of God and man, there is no suggestion of this in the Genesis text. On the contrary, there the serpent is a part of the animal creation, singled out only as being more subtle than the other beasts. He is not, as in Milton's epic, the titanic prince of darkness striking a blow in his warfare against the Almighty. Accordingly he does not, as in later tradition, represent the presence of explicit moral evil in paradise prior to man's first sin. Indeed he is not properly described as a tempter at all in the sense of one who deliberately solicits to evil. This is later interpretation of the mythic material. The serpent is amoral, and the urge which he embodies is ethically neutral even though it leads to evil consequences."(Ibid., p. 319).

In the light of this thinking, then, it becomes obvious that Adam is relieved of a major part of responsibility for his Fall. At least he is freer of such responsibility than he can be in the Augustinian tradition. At the same time, however, since John Hick takes the notion of Satan "as a vivid symbol of 'the demonic' in the sense of evil solely for the sake of evil,"[1] he allows more responsibility to God for the existence of evil. Thus he writes,

> In contrast the Irenaean type of theodicy in its developed form, as we find it in Schliermacher and later thinkers, accepts God's ultimate omni-responsibility and seeks to show for what good and justifying reason He has created a universe in which evil was inevitable.[2]

Despite some disagreement we can find with Hick's interpretation of Irenaeus, it is still to his credit that he considers the childhood analogy of Irenaeus an important factor in our understanding the Fall of Adam. Obviously Irenaeus does not impose a very heavy responsibility on Adam for his own Fall. This is well depicted in the comparison he makes between

---

[1] Ibid., p. 266.

[2] Ibid., p. 262. Cf. Ibid., p. 292.

Cain and Adam; after telling a story of Cain, he compares the case of Adam.

> And he was not softened even by this, nor did he stop short with that evil deed; but being asked where his brother was, he said, "I know not; am I my brother's keeper?" extending and aggravating [his] wickedness by his answer. For if it is wicked to slay a brother, much worse is it thus insolently and irreverently to reply to the omniscient God as if he could baffle Him. And for this he did himself bear a curse about with him, because he gratuitously brought an offering of sin, having had no reverence for God, nor being put to confusion by the act of fractricide.[1]
>
> The case of Adam, however, had no analogy with this, but was altogether different. For having been beguiled by another under the pretext of immortality he is immediately seized with terror, and hides himself; not as if he were able to escape from God; but in a state of confusion at having transgressed His command, he feels unworthy to appear before and to hold converse with God.[2]

In these two passages, we notice that Irenaeus uses the term, confusus, which implies that Adam's action was done without his clear understanding of his own action while Cain was not confused. Cain knew what he was doing. Irenaeus recognizes a definite difference between Cain's and Adam's cases; one was the action done in the actor's full awareness and the other in the state of confusion. Thus Irenaeus uses the term, "sin" (peccatum) for Cain's action whereas he describes that of Adam as something done in the state of confusion, which is directly related to his being morally inexperienced. This point is confirmed when he writes,

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.23.4, pp. 456-457.

[2] Ibid., III.23.5, p. 457. The Latin text for "under the pretext of immortality" reads: "sub occasione immortalitatis", and the Greek word of "sub occasione" is προφάσει . It implies the Devil's deception, because he pretends as if he had immortality. (Stieren, op.cit., p. 549).

> But the man was a little one, and his discretion still undeveloped, wherefore he was easily misled by the deceiver.[1]

Cain was more guilty than Adam and deserved more punishment than Adam. For this reason, God did not pronounce a curse against Adam personally,[2] whereas He "became exceedingly angry and cursed Cain."[3]

---

[1] Proof of the Apostolic Preaching, 12, p. 55.

[2] Against Heresies, III.23.3, p. 456.

[3] Proof of the Apostolic Preaching, 17, p. 58. In this connection, Lawson stresses that it was Adam's inexperience that caused him to fall rather than moral imperfection. Thus he seems to relate man's moral perfection with his freedom and moral experience with his knowledge. (op.cit., p. 218).

Irenaeus also makes it very plain that God gladly forgave Adam for his transgression because of his penitential attitude, while Cain deserved God's curse because of his arrogant attitude toward God, Himself.

Thus Irenaeus' understanding of the Fall of Adam in relation to his pre-fallen state as a child is certainly distinct from the Fall interpreted by Augustine and later Calvin.[1] Whether this interpretation of Adam as only potentially perfected being, thus holding the developmental view of man, is biblical or not, this we can judge as we proceed with our discussion on sin. Nonetheless, we can say with Lawson that

> A dispassionate reading of Genesis 2 and 3 will reveal a picture of man coming from the hand of his Maker pure and lovely indeed, but inexperienced and painfully easy to deceive. Furthermore, cruel awakening to the inescapable and dire consequences of wrong-doing works not sinful rebellion, but penitence, while that penitence is met not by divine wrath but with consolation and remedy. We may candidly agree that St. Irenaeus tended to stress those elements in the story which serve to extenuate Adam's sin, while the bulk of traditional theologians have strongly emphasized those which condemn.[2]

---

[1] Cf. N. P. Williams, The Ideas of the Fall And of Original Sin (London, New York, Toronto: Longmans, Green And Co., 1927), p. 195.

[2] Lawson, op.cit., p. 219.

Putting this aspect of "Adam's confusion" as one of the fundamental anthropological premises of Irenaeus, we now move on to study his understanding of sin.

(2) Sin and Death

We have already discussed that Irenaeus thinks of the Devil as the Lord of sin and death, and we have also noticed that the primal man was like a child whom the Devil could easily deceive. Here we have a reduced estimate of the seriousness of Adam's sin, in which case the notion of sin becomes very weak, unlike the thought of Augustine.

At this point it seems to be necessary to review the position of Augustine briefly for the purpose of comparison between him and Irenaeus. Augustine teaches that sin came with the Fall of Adam and the seriousness of his sin is strongly emphasized. The Fall was due to the evil choice of Adam himself. The responsibility for the Fall rested entirely on Adam who destroyed himself and corrupted his own blessings by misusing his freedom and by succumbing to his pride.[1] Adam's pride was a perverse desire of self-exaltation, for he forsook God to whom the soul ought solely to cleave to make himself the initiator. Thus Augustine develops the importance of the interior attitude to the problem of sin.

---

[1] Augustine, "Enchirdion," The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Series One, Vol. III, 30, p. 247.

Augustine not only speaks of sin as the result of the first man's own fault, but he also speaks of humanity as a *massa peccati*, "a lump of sin." The original sin, transmitted to his descendants, corrupted them. Thus Augustine writes,

> Thence, after [his sin], he was driven into exile, and by his sin the whole race of which he was the root was corrupted in him, and thereby subjected to the penalty of death. And so it happens that all descended from him, and from the woman who had led him into sin, and was condemned at the same time with him,--being the offspring of carnal lust on which the same punishment of disobedience was visited,--were tainted with the original sin, . . .[1]

This idea receives a strong support by Calvin in the 16th century when he writes,

> . . . but he [Adam] involved his posterity also, and plunged them in the same wretchedness. This is the hereditary corruption to which early Christian writers gave the name of Original sin, meaning by the term the depravation of a nature formerly good and pure.[2]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, 26, p. 246.

[2] John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Vol. I, trans. by Henry Beverridge (Michigan: Wm. E. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1953), p. 214.

In the light of this understanding, then, Adam's descendants share the guilt of Adam's sin.[1] Furthermore, Augustine teaches that human will with a burden of original sin can do nothing unless God helps us to accomplish the good.[2] Based on his doctrine of original sin, he thus develops a limited saving will of God. All mankind has become *massa damnata* through Adam's sin, and salvation is made to depend on God's arbitrary election of a certain number which corresponds to the number of the fallen angels.[3] The rest of mankind is left in the lump of sin and has to endure the damnation which all have earned through Adam's sin.[4]

The doctrine of predestination, taught by Augustine, does not allow the complaint that such an election makes God unjust. He maintains that if all mankind deserve damnation because of his own fault, it is God's sheer benevolence and mercy to elect a certain number of people for beatitude. Those who are not elected do not have any right to complain. Obviously Augustine teaches that no one has a legal claim to God's mercy. A sinner needs God's grace to be saved and if he does not have God's grace, he is eternally lost. At the same time, if God decides to bestow His grace on him, it is irresistible.[1]

---

[1] Augustine, *Enchirdion*, 48, p. 253.

[2] *Ibid*., 32, p. 248.

[3] Augustine makes this point quite explicitly when he writes, ". . . mankind who constituted the remainder of the intelligent creation, having perished without exception under sin, both original and actual, and the consequent punishments, should be in part restored, and should fill up the gap which the rebellion and fall of the devils had left in the company of the angels." (*Ibid*., 29, p. 247).

[4] *Ibid*., 27, p. 246. Also see *ibid*., 51, p. 254.

Summing up, we may say that Augustine not only reduces sin to personal guilt, but he also manages to conceive that sin is powerful enough to leave the non-elected people in the damnation.[2] Furthermore, the person and work of Christ seem to be efficacious only for the elected, thus reducing the power of His ultimate victory to a certain number of the elected.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, 104, p. 271. Also see *ibid.*, 105, 271. Sydney Cave makes a very interesting comment on Augustine's teaching of grace. "In other connexions Augustine has written more nobly than any of the fathers of the ancient Church on the love of God, but in the rationalization of his experience of God's grace he depicts a God who is more like an Oriental despot than the Father of our Lord and Savior of Jesus Christ." (*The Christian Estimate of Man* /London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1944/, p. 99).

[2] Augustine, *Enchirdion*, 107, p. 272.

Now coming back to Irenaeus, we must examine how he explains sin in the light of his understanding of the demonic structure of evil and the pre-fallen state of Adam. A careful study of the following passage will give us some idea of Irenaeus' understanding of sin:

> And therefore in the last times the Lord has restored us into friendship through His incarnation, having become "the Mediator between God and men;" propiating indeed for us the Father against whom we had sinned, and cancelling (consolatus) our disobedience by His own obedience; conferring also upon us the gift of communion with, and subjection to, our Maker. For this reason also He has taught us to say in prayer, "And forgive us our debts;" since indeed He is our Father, whose debtors we were, having transgressed His commandments.[1]

Here we find that it is Christ who propiates our sin and it is the Father against whom we had sinned and finally it is implied that sin is disobedience. After accepting the demonic temptation by disobeying God's commandments, man discovered the falsity of the demonic claim. But the tragic rule of the Devil began and men were to fight in painful agony to become "the sons of God" instead of "the sons of the Devil."

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.17.1, p. 544.

Man is to suffer as much as he disobeyed. This is also to say that man is responsible for the tragic rule of the Devil inasmuch as it was he who was tempted. However, his disobedience is not something that man himself can cancel; it is only Christ who can cancel the disobedience of man. This is consistent with Irenaeus' basic understanding of the problem of evil. Needless to say, man is involved in the whole problem of evil because it is through man that the Devil stands in opposition to God, but it is not man who can ultimately defeat the power of the evil.

It is noteworthy that Irenaeus calls us "debtors" (debitores) to God; we owe obedience to God because we have been created in His image, and we became debtors by transgressing His commandments. But strangely enough it is Christ who pays back our debts to God.

For Irenaeus, sin is something unnatural because it is an act committed by man against his Maker. Anything that man does against his Maker is unnatural. As long as man remains in the unnatural state, he is not possessed of true life. True life means to live in God, the only source of life. Negatively speaking, sin is following the Devil instead of following God. In order to follow the Devil, men become debtors to God, because it is disobedience to God that makes men follow the Devil. Thus Irenaeus understands sin as "something against God," which is also the unifying definition of sin all through the Old and the New Testament.[1]

At this point, we must ask how Adam was able to disobey God. Prior to Adam's disobedience, the choice was his--that is, Adam had a freedom to choose between obedience and disobedience. In this sense, there is hardly any difference between Augustine and Irenaeus, because they both refer to Adam's disobedience as being of his own choice. In Irenaeus, however, Adam's misuse of freedom is more readily forgiven because of Adam's pre-fallen state as an infant. Furthermore, for Irenaeus, unlike Augustine, Adam's disobedience still leaves men free.[1]

---

[1] The word, sin, often appears in the Bible. The most common and formal word used for sin in the Bible is ἁμαρτία, which commonly means deviation from good. Often sin is thought of as something in contrast with good with an implication of external badness, but the terms like κακία or πονηρία specially indicate spiritual badness. Sometimes to violate the law is considered to be sinful; the example of this can be found in a word like ἀνομία used for sin, for it means lawless. There are other terms used for sin which have ethical implication; that is, the term ἀδικία means injustice and unrighteousness. The term used with theological orientation implies an estrangement from God. Thus the variety of terms in the Scripture shows the difficulty of defining sin in a single sentence. Generally speaking, however, one can discern formal, theological, moral, spiritual, and ethical sins from the terms used in the Bible. While it is obvious that there is no single way of defining the nature of sin, it seems to be possible to say that the unifying nature of sin all through the Old and the New Testament can be stated as "something against God."

To elaborate our discussion, we must examine the notion of original sin in the thought of Irenaeus. Irenaeus believes that the image of God in which man was created was not lost, even after the Fall of man. The fact that the creative process toward the perfection of the likeness was interrupted by the Fall does not mean that man lost that image. If man still possesses the image of God in which he was created, man is not without his free will. Then the descendants of Adam who have their own free will cannot share the guilt of Adam's disobedience.

---

[1] H. W. Robinson makes an interesting comparison between the Eastern and Western writers in regard to their interpretation of Adam's disobedience. He writes, "The constructive use made of Adam's act of disobedience is markedly and characteristically different in the two lines of Eastern and Western writers. To the former that act is the primary type of man's sin; to the latter, its fountain-head. On the one hand, Adam stands in the forefront of a long line of sinners like himself, for whom the chief consequences of his act lie in the universal mortality of the human race; on the other, Adam has once for all corrupted the human nature which flows from his loins, and has left it in helpless guilt before God." (op.cit., pp. 165-166). In this case Irenaeus can represent East and Augustine West.

Irenaeus often stresses that sin is a matter of moral choice, not of inborn nature. The following passage will confirm this idea:

> The light does never enslave any one by necessity; nor, again does God exercise compulsion upon any one unwilling to accept the exercise of His skill. Those persons, therefore, who have apostatized from the light given by the Father, and transgressed the law of liberty, have done so through their own fault, since they have been created free agents, and possessed power of themselves.[1]

Irenaeus' discussion of sin as a matter of moral choice is in conjunction with his refutation of the Gnostics. He describes three kinds of men conceived by the Gnostics:

> They conceive, then, of three kinds of men, spiritual, material, and animal, represented by Cain, Abel, and Seth. These three natures are no longer found in one person, but constitute various kinds [of men]. The material goes as a matter of course, into corruption. The animal, if it makes choice of the better part, finds repose in the intermediate place; but if the worse, it too shall pass into destruction. But they assert that the spiritual principles . . . at last attaining to perfection, shall be given as brides to the angels of the Savior.[2]

According to this theory, the different levels of moral attainment in man had to do with their inborn constitution.

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.39.3, p. 523.

[2] Ibid., I.7.5, p. 326. [ ] in the original.

In this sense the Gnostic concept of man does not give any freedom to man which he can use either in a good or bad way. Over against this, Irenaeus strongly insists on the freedom of man which man uses either to become wheat or chaff.[1]

In the light of the relation which Irenaeus sees between human free will and his sin, we can assert that Irenaeus does not believe in original sin in the proper sense of the word. In other words, Irenaeus firmly maintains that it is by the individual's choice that he becomes either "the son of the devil" or "the son of God." Thus Irenaeus does not teach original sin which allows no room for volitional activity of the individual. He makes it clear that it is not Adam who sins in the individual, but it is an individual who sins in Adam.

We must now ask, then, whether Irenaeus has a tendency toward defining sin as simply a breaking of the moral law, giving no other meaning to sin than as separate and individual acts of sin. We find many passages in the writings of Irenaeus in which he teaches that the first man's disobedience is the source of the general sinfulness and mortality of mankind, and man's enslavement to the Devil.

---

[1] *Supra*, p. 126.

> For as by the disobedience of the one man who was originally moulded from virgin soil, the many were made sinners, and forfeited life; so was it necessary that, by the obedience of one man, who was originally born from a virgin, many should be justified and receive salvation.[1]

It is from such passages that many scholars maintain that Irenaeus asserts the Catholic doctrine of original sin. Kelly writes,

> The theme, based on Rom. 5, that the human race sinned 'in Adam' recurs so frequently that quotation is superflous. Irenaeus nowhere formulates a specific account of the connexion between Adam's guilty act and the rest of mankind. He clearly presupposes some kind of mystical solidarity, or rather identity, between the father of the race and all his descendants.[2]

As Kelly points out, we have too many passages in which Irenaeus describes solidarity between Adam's disobedience and his descendants to deny his belief in some sort of original sin.

Undoubtedly, Irenaeus teaches some notion of original sin; he teaches that the Fall of Adam put his descendants under the power of sin and death. At the same time, however, his belief in man's freedom even after the Fall does not allow him to teach original sin in the same sense as Augustine.[1] In his view of original sin, Irenaeus goes beyond a simple moralistic view of sin, because to a certain extent he regards sin organically. In this sense he is not as optimistic as some of the modern liberal theologians in regard to human nature, but he is not as pessimistic as the Augustinians. At this point, it is worth noticing that Irenaeus speaks of Adam's sin and its impact on his descendants to stress that the grace of Second Adam, Christ, is more than enough to annul the effect of Adam's sin. This will become more obvious when we discuss his doctrine of "Recapitulation" in the 7th chapter.

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.18.7, p. 448.

[2] Kelly, op.cit., p. 172. Cf. Altaner, op.cit., p. 157 and Quasten, op.cit., p. 311.

By examining the notion of original sin, we have elaborated our discussion on Adam's disobedience and freedom and contrasted views held by Augustine and Irenaeus. Now it will be to our advantage to consider one other recent theory in regard to Adam's disobedience and freedom, because it is somewhat related to Irenaeus.

---

[1] _Supra_, p. 145.

John Hick sets forth the theory called, "epistemic distance." He indicates the logical impossibility of the theory of an angelic or a human fall; he argues,

> To say that a blessed angel, dwelling in the immediate presence of God, suddenly becomes evil and commits the irrationality of sin is to imply **either** that God had created him as an irrational angel or that in his first sinful volition evil created itself *ex nihilo*. The first of these possibilities is incompatible with the perfect goodness and the second with the unlimited sovereignty of God. It remains true, then, that an angelic or a human fall presupposes some temptation such as is not conceivable in finitely perfect creatures existing consciously in the presence of God.[1]

Based on this argument, he maintains that the temptation only becomes possible in an environment where a human being can exercise his human autonomy unconscious of God's presence. Thus he sets forth the theory of "epistemic distance," according to which he argues that it was possible for man to direct his attention elsewhere than to God with the God-given freedom. The only way man can exercise his autonomy is for God to set man at a distance from Himself, from which he can then voluntarily come to God.[2] The most logical distance between God and man that would make room for a degree of human autonomy is epistemic distance. He describes this distance,

---

[1] Hick, *op.cit.*, p. 317.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 320.

> . . . the reality and the presence of God must not be borne in upon men in the coercive way in which their natural environment forces itself upon their attention. The world must be to men, to some extent at least, _etsi deus non daretur_, 'as if there were no God'. God must be a hidden deity, veiled by His creation. He must be knowable, but only by a mode of knowledge that involves a free personal response on man's part, this response consisting in an uncompelled interpretative activity whereby we experience the world as mediating the divine presence.[1]

Consistent with this theory is his explanation of the serpent as the "first scientist," of his temptation as "the earliest hypothesis," and of the Fall as "the first and most daring experiment."[2] The serpent's temptation was to tempt man to explore the world, disregarding the religious taboo that forbade eating of the tree of knowledge. And man's epistemic distance from God made it possible for man to be tempted, that is, to disobey God's commandment not to eat of the tree of knowledge.

> Man investigates nature, thereby treating it as a natural phenomenon, _etsi deus non daretur_, and in thus turning his primary attention upon the world as an environing order he forfeits the vision of God. He becomes immersed in nature and alienated

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 317.

[2] _Ibid_., p. 320.

> from God. This is the basic separation, from which self-alienation and alienation from his fellows inevitably follow.[1]

His thesis of "epistemic distance" makes it perfectly possible and tempting to understand the world scientifically without reference to God, in which case the exercise of man's freedom against God becomes understandable. At the same time, however, we must note that if it is not inevitable for man to respond to God because His presence is not obvious, it is only through a moral decision that man responds to God. For this reason faith becomes of cardinal importance.[2] Thus what he is actually doing on the basis of "epistemic distance" is to paint the world in such a way that both man's freedom and the importance of using this freedom in a right way can be insured. He writes,

> Thus the world, as the environment of man's life, will be religiously ambiguous, both veiling God and revealing Him--veiling Him to ensure man's freedom and revealing Him

---

[1] John Hick argues that the "knowledge of good and evil" that Adam and Eve attained by eating the forbidden fruit does not specifically mean an awareness of moral good and evil as it has been generally understood; rather it is knowledge in general. On this basis he maintains that the temptation was experimenting to see if the world can be regarded as an independent order. (*Ibid*., p. 321).

[2] He relates cognitive freedom and moral choice very closely. He writes, "The awareness of God is not forced upon man; it is the moral decision to use man's cognitive freedom in a way that he would be aware of God." (*Ibid*., p. 319).

to men as they rightly exercise that freedom.[1]

Now we have to examine what this thesis of John Hick has to do with Irenaeus' understanding of disobedience in relation with human freedom. We find some support of this thesis in the thought of Irenaeus in the sense that Irenaeus also finds the reason for man's moral decision to disobey God's commandment in his child-like condition. This situation points to man's cognitive as well as moral inexperience. Therefore, man, as God's free creature, could misuse his freedom and chose disobedience.

Hick interprets the Fall not as a past catastrophe but as man's distance from God's goal, "not because he has fallen from that goal but because he has yet to arrive at it."[1] Thus he safeguards the importance of man's moral choice with his cognitive freedom in a world where imperfect human beings can advance through the vale of soul-making toward the maturity of the sons of God. This teleological view of man also finds support in Irenaeus' anthropology.[2]

Hick's contribution is that he grasped some of the basic anthropological principles of Irenaeus and presented a philosophical argument to the modern readers. At the same time, however, his endeavor to present a rational, philosophical theory in regard to the problem of theodicy makes him leave Irenaeus at the crucial point and go his own way.

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 319.

[2] *Infra*, p. 253.

Hick's philosophical approach to the problem of evil does not allow him to accept "the demonic structure of evil" in its full sense. For Irenaeus the problem of evil was something that had to be dealt with theologically. It was the powerful theological language of Irenaeus that made him develop a contrast between the divine and the demonic and find the real omnipotent power of God in His victory over the Devil. Furthermore, in a number of passages Irenaeus speaks of the kind of creation that reveals the glory of the Creator. Thus Irenaeus does not depict a world where man had epistemic distance from God.

John Hick protected man as God's innocent child in spite of his Fall, as opposed to the Augustinian horror of man, by making his starting point the Irenaean interpretation of the pre-fallen state of man. But his endeavor to present a philosophical argument in regard to the ultimate problem of evil creates a wide gap between himself and Irenaeus.

Irenaeus leaves the ultimate problem of the Devil as the "mystery," while Hick's philosophical language reduces this mystery to a "problem." Thus Hick departs from Irenaeus and loses the vision of the triumphant Lord who defeats the Devil and leads men toward the final victory through a stage to be continued beyond this life.

At this point, we have to examine whether sin is, to a certain extent, kept in the background in the thought of Irenaeus. Some scholars assert that in common with other Eastern Fathers, Irenaeus places relatively little emphasis on sin because he regards salvation as a bestowal of life rather than that of forgiveness. They also indicate that Irenaeus sees salvation as a victory of mortality rather than over sin.[1]

Perhaps one of the best ways to find out whether this kind of assertion is valid is to examine Irenaeus' concept of sin in relation to death. It is very true that in the theology of Eastern Fathers we see a very close relationship between man's Fall and death. Especially, in Atanasius we find a strong emphasis on death as the result of man's transgression.[1] Irenaeus, before his great successor, Athanasius, expounded the inseparable relationship between man's transgression and death; he recites over and over again that death is the result of man's disobedience.

---

[1] Aulén points out that this kind of assertion is rather common among the scholars. (op.cit., p. 22). Cf. Cave, op.cit., p. 84.

If death was the result of man's Fall, it is natural to speak of the salvation in terms of the victory over mortality. However, if this notion leads us to say that sin does not receive its due attention in the thought of Irenaeus, it is quite misleading. This point becomes self-evident as we examine the interrelatedness of sin and death.

Irenaeus' concept of sin and death points to man's defeat as "ethical" as well as "physical." In fact, it is characteristic of Irenaeus to relate the ethical and physical defeat in such a way that they cannot be separated.

---

[1] Athnasius writes, "For God not only made us out of nothing; but he gave us freely, by the grace of the Word, a life in correspondence with God. But men, having rejected things eternal, and by counsel of the devil, turned to the things of corruption, became the cause of their corruption in death, being, as I said before, by nature corruptible, but destined, by the grace following from partaking of the Word, to have escaped their natural state, had they remained good." (op.cit., pp. 59-60).

If the Devil brought death to man under the pretext of immortality, man's defeat is physical. If it is man's disobedience (sin) that allowed death, man's defeat becomes ethical. The proof that defeat is ethical is found in the passages where Irenaeus describes Adam after the Fall as being penitent without any sense of physical affliction.[1] Then death is the direct outcome of sin, and we see that the logical interrelatedness of sin and death in obvious.

Related to our present discussion is Irenaeus' concept of "flesh" (σάρξ). Whereas the dualistic scheme of the Gnostics makes a very sharp contrast between matter and spirit and locates the seat of sin in matter, Irenaeus thinks of sin as affecting the whole man. Sometimes Irenaeus seems to view the flesh as the seat of sin, and he describes flesh as the opposite of the spirit. In fact, Irenaeus quotes St. Paul rather extensively and presents flesh as something which stands in perpetual need of the spiritual.[2] At this point, however, we must note that Irenaeus sees the whole man as flesh, in which case it becomes clear that he does not identify only the body with flesh. Indeed, Irenaeus is able to grasp the true Pauline concept of flesh; he sees that if the sarx is the seat of the sin in Paul, it is the whole man who has to be considered as sinner, because Paul sees the sarx as the motion of rebellion against God.[1] Thus Irenaeus speaks of man as flesh who is in constant need of the Spirit of God.[2] The flesh which became subject to corruption and death due to the Fall has a physical implication, but not in separation from the ethical.[3]

---

[1] Supra, 142.

[2] Against Heresies, V.10 and V.11, pp. 536-537. Cf. I Cor. 15:50, Rom. 8:8, Rom. 8:9, Gal. 5:19, 5:22.

Perhaps one other way of dealing with this problem of sin and death is to seek for the meaning of life in Irenaeus in contrast to that of flesh. Irenaeus writes,

---

[1] Werner Georg Kümmel deals with the Pauline concept of flesh; he takes biblical passages like Rom. 1:20, 2:15, 7:14ff and discusses them and concludes that they confirm the argument that "Paul sees the whole man as sarx and consequently as sinner." He writes, "Sarx denotes the man who lets himself be determined by his actual historical existence in the world; it does not describe man in his fundamental nature, but rather in his membership in this passing evil age (Gal. 14)." (Man in the New Testament, trans. by John J. Vincent /London: The Epworth Press, 1963/, pp. 61-63).

[2] Against Heresies, V.10.1, p. 536.

[3] Irenaeus writes, "In these members, therefore, in which we were going to destruction by working the works of corruption, in these very members are we made alive by working the works of the Spirit." (Ibid., V.11.2, p. 537).

> It is good to obey God, and to believe in Him, and to keep His commandments, and this is the life of man; as not to obey God is evil, and this is his death.[1]

Here we see that Irenaeus identifies life with obedience to God and death with disobedience to God. In this case both life and death receive more meaning than mere existence and non-existence. In other words, the simple fact that man continues to exist does not mean that he lives in a true sense. As long as man exists in sin (disobedience) he is not living, but he is existing as dead. For Irenaeus life means to live in God, and to be dead means to be alienated from God.

We may conclude that Irenaeus interprets death not only as the physical end of life, but as the state of man in sin. It is impossible to recover the life man had lost and to bring him immortality without curing man of his corruption.[2] We may also add that man's corruption is both ethical and physical. Then Christ, as the bringer of life, is not only the One who bestows life upon man but He is the One who makes it possible for man to have life by forgiving man's sin.[1]

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.39.1, p. 522. The Latin text in Stieren's edition is as follows: "Deo et credere ei et custodire eius praeceptum; et hoc et vita hominis; quemadmodum non obedire Deo, malum; et hoc est mors eius." (op.cit., p. 703).

[2] Against Heresies, IV.38.4, p. 522.

Now we may conclude that it is quite misleading to say that in Irenaeus sin is put aside because of his emphasis on death, for in a sense, it is precisely his emphasis on death that makes him see the seriousness of sin; there is no essential opposition between sin and death in his teaching. Sin and death can never be separated in terms of their cause and result; sin is the cause of death and death is the natural thing given to a sinner. The result of conquering both sin and death is life; life is freedom from the power of sin and death. This freedom is brought only through Christ's work of salvation.

(3) Sin and This World

We are well aware that the Gnostics had naturalistic understanding of the kosmos as a whole entity of existence opposed to God. Irenaeus' thorough refutation of the Gnostic dualism would not allow him to say that the world as such is in opposition to God. We have seen that one of the fundamental principles in the theology of Irenaeus is that there is only one God, the Creator, and His creation is good. Furthermore, he makes it very clear that the things of the world cannot be bad, because it is God who exercises the providence of all things.[1]

---

[1] Supra, p. 147.

Christian theologians had to meet serious difficulties in considering the relations of God and the world, especially due to the problem of the origin of evil. One of the solutions for this problem was to make evil reside in matter, and in order to keep God clear from any responsibility for the existence of evil, matter was regarded as possessing an independent reality of its own. Thus even in a number of passages in the Bible, especially in the Johannine writings,[2] it is suggested that sin and this world are closely related.

For Irenaeus, however, living in the world does not in itself involve servitude to Satan; it is rather the way man lives in the world that involves servitude to Satan. It is sinful actions in the world that are antagonistic to God, but not the world itself.

Essentially the problem is solely in man, his wound and his healing; it is well demonstrated in the fact that the Devil stands in opposition to God by tempting man in the world. When man follows the Maker of the world instead of the Devil, the kosmos reveals its goodness as the creation of God.[1] And even if the Devil stands in opposition to God as his activity is continued, it is only historical, not natural and timeless, because ultimately the victory is God's.

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.25.1, p. 459.

[2] I John 2:15-16.

(4) Bondage of the Law

There are three terms we find in the writings of Irenaeus which he uses in relation to the law. Among them we find two sharply contrasting terms, "bondage" and "liberty." The third term is "natural."

To begin with, let us examine some cases in which the term, "natural" is used.

> For God at the first, indeed, warning them by means of natural precepts, which from the beginning He had implanted in mankind, that is by means of the Decalogue (which if any one does not observe, he has no salvation), did then demand nothing more of them.[2]

---

[1] Cf. Theophilus, op.cit., II.17, p. 101. He writes, ". . . for nothing was made evil by God, but all things good, yea, very good,--but the sin in which man was concerned brought evil upon them. . . . so in like manner it came to pass, that in the case of man's sin, he being master, all that was subject to him sinned with him. When, therefore, man again shall have made his way back to his natural condition, and no longer does evil, those also shall be restored to their original gentleness."

[2] Against Heresies, IV.15.1, p. 479.

In this passage we notice that *naturalia praecepta* is something that was implanted in mankind by God.[1] And the content of the *naturalia praecepta* is identified with the Decalogue.

We find another passage in which Irenaeus uses the term, *naturalia Legis*. It reads as following:

> And the Lord did not abrogate the natural [precepts] of the law, by which man is justified, which also those who were justified by faith, and who pleased God, did observe previous to the giving of the law, but that He extended and fulfilled them, is shown from His words.[2]

Here *naturalia Legis* is described as the law by which man (the natural man) is justified and so it is the law that was given previous to the formal law. Furthermore, it is the law that is relevant to every man even after the coming of the Lord, precisely because it is the law that is natural. At this point, we are reminded that for Irenaeus to call a thing "natural" is very often to imply it is "divine" in the sense that anything that is against God is unnatural, God being the Creator of everything and the bestower of life. This leads us to say that the natural law is the law which all men have to keep in order to remain natural.

---

[1] Cf. Rom. 2:14. It reads, "ὅταν γὰρ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶσιν, οὗτοι νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες ἑαυτος εἴσιν νόμος." Here St. Paul is saying that the Gentiles, even though they were not given laws, do what the law requires by nature. Then in verse 15, he writes, "τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν. . ."

[2] *Against Heresies*, IV.13.1, p. 477. [ ] in the original. The Latin text in W. Wignan Harvey's edition is as following: "Et quia Dominus naturalia Legis, per quae homo justificatur, quae etiam ante legisdationem custodiebant qui fide justificabantur et placebant Deo, non dissolvit, sed extendit et implevit, ex sermonibus ejus ostenditur." (*Sancti Irenaei*, Vol. II [Cambridge: Typis Academicis, (1857), 1965], pp. 180-181). Harvey has a comment on *homo*: "homo, the natural man, Rom. ii 27, keeping the spirit of the law by the degree of light still retained." (*Ibid*., p. 180).

The natural law concept which Irenaeus teaches should be understood in a theological context. It is also obvious that his natural law concept is very closely related to one of his basic anthropological principles, that is, man was created in the image of God endowed with free will. In other words, man as a creature of God is naturally given the ability to order his conduct with respect to God.[1]

The actual source of natural precepts in man, then, is God Himself; and it was an entirely free act of God that man was created in such a way that he would recognize certain natural precepts. God was not by necessity bound to do so. Furthermore, it was merely for the welfare of men that God put men under the natural law.[1] God made it natural for men to follow Him from the beginning as a way of salvation.

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.15.2, p. 480. At the last part of this section Irenaeus specifically mentions that man's freedom and God's exhortations exist together.

> Nor did He stand in need of our service when He ordered us to follow Him; but He thus bestowed salvation upon ourselves.[2]

Thus the natural law teaching in Irenaeus is to be interpreted in the light of salvation; Irenaeus does not seem to know of metaphysical natural law. The natural law is given to man in creation, ultimately for the salvation of man, because it is only natural for man to be such that he would love God and his neighbor. Then the divine law the expression of which is found in the Decalogue is virtually identified with the concept of natural law in Irenaeus.[1]

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.14, pp. 478-479. Cf. Stanley Samuel Harakas, "The Natural Law Teaching in the Ante-Nicene Fathers and in Modern Greek Orthodox Theology," Boston University Graduate School Ph.D Dissertation, 1965, p. 152. He writes, "If one should ask what is the actual source of the moral law in God, Irenaeus clearly does not belong to the Platonic-Aristotelian-Scholastic position. God's thoughts and will are in reality one in Irenaeus' thinking. Thus, any idea of the Good being independent of the Will of God, to which God would be bound by necessity and which would curtail the freedom of God is rejected."

[2] Against Heresies, IV.14.1, p. 478.

Man did not live according to the natural precept that had been imprinted by God. Thus he became unnatural. This is also to say that man's going astray from the natural law can be defined as sin.[2] When we relate the law with sin, we find Irenaeus using the expression, "bondage of the law."

We note that Irenaeus does not use the term, "bondage" with the natural law, because the natural law, as the divine law of God that was given to man in his heart, was for his sake. In fact, it was something that was inherent in man without which man cannot be man in a complete sense.

It is in connection with man's sin that Irenaeus associates the word, "bondage" with the law. And this law which is described as "bondage" is the Jewish ceremonial law.

---

[1] In this respect the Reformers are following the line of Irenaeus' thought. Walter G. Muelder makes a comment on the natural law concept in the Reformers, which confirms their kinship with Irenaeus. "In the Reformation period a major revolution in thinking about the natural law of justice was initiated. Neither Luther nor Calvin overthrew the medieval concept entirely, but they tended to identify the natural law with the divine law and especially with the Decalogue." (Moral Law in Christian Social Ethics /Richmond Virginia: John Knox Press, 1966/, p. 132).

[2] Supra, p. 148.

> But to the Jews He was as Lord and Lawgiver, for when in the mean time mankind had forgotten and fallen away and rebelled against God, He brought them into subjection through the Law, that they might learn that they had a Lord who was author and maker, who grants the breath of life; and to Him we must return homage by day and by night.[1]

The ceremonial law was given to the Jews to bridle their desires. This point is made more apparent when Irenaeus explains why the Lord did not give the covenant to the fathers:

> Why, then, did the Lord not form the covenant for the fathers? Because "the law was not established for righteous men." But the righteous fathers had the meaning of the Decalogue written in their hearts and souls, that is, they loved the God who made them, and did no injury to their neighbor. There was therefore no occasion that they should be cautioned by prohibitory mandates (correptoriis literis), because they had the righteousness of law in themselves.[2]

---

[1] Proof of the Apostolic Preaching, 8, p. 52. "brought them into subjection" does not mean that God brought mankind in general into subjection through the law, but the Jews who had fallen away from God. Also see Against Heresies, IV.15.2, p. 480. Here Irenaeus writes that certain precepts were enacted by Moses because of the hardness of their heart.

[2] Against Heresies, IV.16.3, p. 481. Hearts and souls are referred to as moral and mental natures. Thus this confirms again that the natural law is a part of man's moral and mental natures.

The law was seen as bondage because it was necessary due to the sin of man. In this sense it was a punishment placed by God on man. On the other hand, the law was for those in bondage to set them free from the bondage of sin. In this case the purpose of the law was God's means to make men serve Him. Thus writes Irenaeus,

> For the law, since it was laid down for those in bondage, [was] used to instruct the soul by means of those corporeal objects which were of an external nature, drawing it as by a bond, to obey its commandments, that man might learn to serve God.[1]

In the giving of the law, the abundant love of God for His lost people was well expressed. Thus if God's imposition of the bondage of the law on man can be understood in terms of His final purpose, it is also in His final purpose that the goodness of the law can be found.

This aspect of the goodness of the law can be elaborated as we proceed in our discussion to the law of liberty. Irenaeus applies the word "liberty" in relation to the law along with Christ; he actually identifies "the law of liberty" with the "word of God" and he writes that

> They used the Mosaic law until the coming of the Lord; but from the Lord's advent

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.13.2, p. 477. Also see IV.16.5, p. 482.

> the new covenant which brings back peace, and the law which gives life, has gone forth over the whole earth.[1]

Does the foregoing mean that Christ abrogated the old law by bringing the new law? We find a number of passages in Irenaeus that point to the superiority of the new law over the old law, because the legislation which has been given for the sake of liberty is greater than that which has been given for the sake of bondage.[2] Despite the fact that Irenaeus actually states that the new covenant cancelled the old covenant,[3] nonetheless, he argues in terms of a continuity between the two laws. In the same passage where he states the superiority of the new law over the old, he gives an analysis of the terms, "greater and less."

> But [the words] greater and less are not applied to those things which have nothing in common between themselves, and are of an opposite nature, and mutually repugnant; but are used in the case of those of the same substance, and which possess properties

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.34.4, p. 512.

[2] Ibid., IV.9.2, p. 472.

[3] Ibid., IV.16.5, p. 482.

> in common, but merely differ in number and size; . . .[1]

This analysis makes it evident that there is a definite continuity between the two laws.

One other way to demonstrate this continuity is that the old and the new have but one Author. If both laws were given by the same Author, it is rather obvious that there cannot be discontinuity radical enough to abrogate one completely. For Irenaeus God the Creator is also God the Redeemer; there is only one God who creates and redeems. Likewise there is one God who is the Author of both laws.

> But one and the same householder produced both covenants, the Word of God our Lord Jesus Christ, who spake with both Abraham and Moses, and who has restored us anew to liberty, and has multiplied that grace which is from Himself.[2]

And the Lord God to whom Christ bears witness is the Lord God who also gave the law. Irenaeus emphasizes this aspect when he writes,

> Who, then, is this Lord God to whom Christ bears witness, whom no man shall tempt, whom all should worship, and serve Him alone? It is beyond all manner of

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.9.2, p. 472. [ ] in the original.

[2] Ibid., IV.9.2, p. 472.

> doubt, that God who also gave the law. For these things have been predicted in the law, and by the words (sententiam) of the law the Lord showed that the law does indeed declare the Word of God from the Father; and the apostate angel of God is destroyed by its voice, being exposed in its true colours, and vanquished by the Son of man keeping the commandment of God.[1]

The old covenant which was the "giving of the law which took place formerly" had played a provisional and preparatory role for the new covenant, which is identified as a "manner of life required by the Gospel."[2] In fact this preparatory role of the old law for the new is one of the favorite subjects of Irenaeus and the early Fathers and he makes use of this to demonstrate the continuity of the Old and the New Testaments.

In order to prove that the old law was preparing the way for the new, Irenaeus indicates that the new covenant was known by the prophets who prepared for it and for the One who made it a reality. Thus he writes,

> For the new covenant having been known and preached by the prophets, He who was to carry it out according to the good pleasure of the Father was also preached, having been

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.21.3, p. 550.

[2] Ibid., IV.9.1, p. 472.

> revealed to men as God pleased; that they might always make progress through believing in Him, and by means of the [successive] covenants, should gradually attain to perfect salvation.[1]

Here we also note that the successive covenants have to do with one of Irenaeus' basic anthropological premises, that is, the idea of growth. In other words, Irenaeus relates the continuity of the two covenants with man's gradual growth toward perfection.

Man does neither attain to perfectum salutis all at once nor he is given it at one time; he reaches it gradually. It is by means of the successive covenants that man attains to perfect salvation. Thus the perfect continuity of the old and the new covenants is found in the final goal of the same Author, that is, in the salvation of men. This idea is beautifully depicted in this passage:

> For there is one salvation and one God; but the precepts which form the man are numerous, and the steps which lead man to God are not a few.[2]

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.9.3, pp. 472-473. [ ] in the original. The Latin text in Harvey's edition is as following: "Novo enim Testamento cognito et praedicato per prophetas, et ille qui illud dispositurus erat secundum placitum Patris praedicabatur, manifestatus hominibus quemadmodum voluit Deus; ut possint semper proficere credentes in eum, et per testamenta maturescere profectum salutis." (op.cit., Vol. II, pp. 170-171).

[2] Against Heresies, IV.9.3, p. 473.

After establishing the continuity of the two covenants in this way, we need to explore another way by which Irenaeus shows the line which links the two covenants. This is the idea of the "fulfillment." For Irenaeus, the denial of Christ's abrogating the old law is always related to His Messianic role, that is, fulfilling the old law. If the old law was given as a bondage to save men from the bondage of sin, the new does not dismiss the notion that human infirmity requires the necessity of the law.[1]

Another way of saying that the people for whom the old law was given and the people for whom the new was brought are not different is to indicate that all natural precepts are common to both of them.[2] In fact, Irenaeus seems to stress that it is the natural precepts that link the old and the new covenants, because they are common in both covenants. Thus he specifically mentions that "the Lord did not abrogate the natural precepts."[3] He mentions that what the Lord cancelled in the old covenant is those precepts which were promulgated to the people of Moses for the concrete situations, but He did not cancel the natural precepts; instead He increased and extended them.[1]

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.15.2, p. 480.

[2] Ibid., IV.13.4, p. 478.

[3] Ibid., IV.13.1, p. 477.

Christ did not abrogate the old covenant inasmuch as He did not abrogate the natural precepts, but He did extend and fulfill it.[2] This is also to say that what became unnecessary was the ceremonial aspect of the law.[3] Thus for Irenaeus the natural law which is identified with the Decalogue is the Christian law as well as the Mosaic law for the Jews.[4]

The new law which Christ brought leads men from a lower level of morality to a higher.

> For as, in the New Testament, that faith of men [to be placed] in God has been increased, receiving in addition [to what was already revealed] the Son of God, that man too might be a partaker of God; so is also our walk in life required to be more circumspect, when we are directed not merely to abstain from evil actions, but even from evil thoughts, and from idle words, and empty talk, and scurrilous language: . . .[5]

---

[1] *Against Heresies*, IV.15.5, p. 482.

[2] *Ibid*., IV.13.4, p. 478.

[3] *Supra*, p. 172.

[4] Cf. Arthur Cushman McGiffert, *A History of Christian Thought*, Vol. I (New York, London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932), pp. 139-140.

[5] *Against Heresies*, IV.28.2, p. 501. [ ] in the original.

In fact, the higher degree of morality is not merely a difference in the level; it is much more radical. The new covenant is beyond the morality of the law; it penetrates into the basic nature of human being. The same Lord "who in the first instance certainly drew slaves to God"[1] set the slaves free with the new law so that men would serve God as His children instead of as slaves.[2]

Thus the law of liberty, which was brought forth by the One who saves men ultimately, goes beyond restraining men from evil deeds; it touches the depth of man's heart, thus forbidding even the desire after the evil deeds.[3]

Finally the idea of the new covenant as the fulfillment of the old points to the fact that it is in the new covenant that men are finally saved, even though it has functional value as the provisional and preparatory law. Ultimately it is through the law of liberty that we become the children of God attaining the salvation of God, because our obedience as servants through the bondage of law is never able to bring us salvation.

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.13.4, p. 478.

[2] Ibid., IV.13.2, p. 477.

[3] Ibid., IV.16.5, p. 482.

ii. Freedom and Grace

A key concept in Irenaeus' language of economy is that of "son." He gives a detailed analysis of this meaning in the following passage.

> Since, therefore, all things were made by God, and since the devil has become the cause of apostasy to himself and others, justly does the Scripture always term those who remain in a state of apostasy "sons of the devil" and the "angels of the wicked one" (maligni). For [the word] "son," as one before me has observed, has a twofold meaning: [one is a] son in the order of nature, because he was born a son; the other, in that he was made so, is reputed a son, although there be a difference between being born so and being made so. . . . According to the nature, then--that is, according to creation, so to speak--we are all sons of God, because we have all been created by God. But with respect to obedience and doctrine we are not all the sons of God: those only are so who believe in Him and do His will.[1]

This passage plainly describes our natural "sonship"--that is our natural relationship to God is that of sonship. At the same time, he also indicates how we can break this natural sonship. It is our choice that we follow the Devil instead of following God, and this can break the sonship and make us "sons of the devil."

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.41.2, pp. 524-525. [ ] in the original.

God the Father, however, seeks for the lost son. If man's sin can keep him far away from God, it is God's grace that would not allow him to break the sonship. If it is man's freedom that makes him disobedient, it is God's grace that makes him obedient. God the Creator who made man "son of God" by creating him is also God the Redeemer who takes the wandering son back to Him through His own Son.

It is the Son of God through whom men remain sons of the Father. It is the "Son who performs the good pleasure of the Father; for the Father sends, and the Son is sent and comes."[1] It is the Son who brings sons to the Father.

> For as it was not possible that the man who had once for all been conquered, and who had been destroyed through disobedience, could reform himself, and obtain the prize of victory; and as it was also impossible that he could attain salvation who had fallen under the power of sin,--the Son effected both these things, being the Word of God, descending from the Father, becoming incarnate, stooping low, even to death, and consummating the arranged plan of our salvation, . . .[2]

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.6.3, p. 468.

[2] Ibid., III.18.2, p. 446.

It is in the Son that we find the exceeding riches of the Father's grace and unlimited love of the Father. In the next chapter we must turn our attention to this Son to see how men are related to Him

CHAPTER V

MAN AND CHRIST

1. Incarnation

The pivot of the theological language of Irenaeus is the doctrine of the Incarnation, because for him the Incarnation is the key to the history of salvation in its totality. With God there is nothing without purpose or due significance,[1] and there are many dispensations of God each of which is directed toward the salvation of men. The Word, who is the dispenser of the paternal grace for the benefit of men, reveals God to men through many dispensations.[2] The Incarnation, however, was the climax of all God's dispensations, because it was God's coming to man and it was God's becoming man so that man could be the son of God.[3] The Incarnation was in a new manner the advent in the flesh that "He might win back to God that human nature (_hominem_) which had departed from God."[1]

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.21.3, p. 493.

[2] Ibid., IV.20.7, p. 489.

[3] Ibid., III.10.2, p. 424.

One of the distinctive ways of Irenaeus' dealing with the Incarnation is his capacity to relate the doctrine of the creation with that of the Incarnation. In one sense the Incarnation is the perfection of the creation. Irenaeus is anxious to show that the original creation and the new order in Christ belong to a single divine plan. One of the foundations of showing this aspect is to maintain that the same _Logos_ through whom God created everything is the _Logos_ incarnate. Thus writes Irenaeus,

> For the creator of the world is truly the Word of God: and this is our Lord, who in the last times was made man, existing in this world, and who in an invisible manner contains all things created, and is inherent in the entire creation, since the Word of God governs and arranges all things; and therefore He came to His own in a visible manner and was made flesh, and hung upon the tree, that He might sum up all things in Himself.[2]

This is consistent with his doctrine of creation which is always directed to a doctrine of redemption. In other words, for Irenaeus the creation is never perfect without God's redemptive work. His use of the Logos doctrine in the Incarnation demonstrates his singular capacity of relating the doctrine of creation with that of the redemption, making the Son the single Lord of all.[1] In the Incarnation, a single hidden human being comes into existence, but this one man includes the entire creation and manifests the perfection of creation in a visible manner.

---

[1] _Against Heresies_, III.10.2, p. 424.

[2] _Ibid._, V.18.3, p. 546. Also see _ibid._, IV.8.2, p.474.

This Incarnation which is inseparably united with the plan of creation was foretold and foreknown. Irenaeus stresses that the Old Testament scriptures and those attributed to Moses in particular make mention of the Son of God, and foretell His advent and Passion.[2] Their foreknowledge in regard to the advent of the Word of God was obtained by God through the Word, in which case it becomes obvious that all the redemptive work for man has been done by God through the Word.

---

[1] Cf. Paul Beuzart, Essai sur la Théologie D'Irénée (Paris: Le Puy-en-Velay, 1908), p. 95.

[2] Against Heresies, IV.10, pp. 473-474.

> But that it was not only the prophets and many righteous men, who foreseeing through the Holy Spirit His advent, prayed that they might attain to that period in which they should see their Lord face to face, and hear His words, the Lord has made manifest, when He says to His disciples, "Many prophets and righteous men have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them; and to hear those things which ye hear, and have not heard them." In what way, then, did they desire both to hear and to see, unless they had foreknowledge of His future advent? But how could they have foreknown it, unless they had previously received foreknowledge from Himself?[1]

The prophecies in the Old Testament about the advent of the Word not only indicate the unity of the two Testaments, but also bear witness to one single plan of God.

Irenaeus speaks of the reason of the prophecies in the Old Testament in terms of their functional value. They were designed to prepare men to receive the Word incarnate.

> For the advent of the King is previously announced by those servants who are sent before Him, in order to the preparation and equipment of those men who are to entertain their Lord.[2]

God chose the patriarchs and raised up the prophets upon earth to prepare a people beforehand and teach them to follow God, accustoming men to bear His Spirit.[1] In this case, Daniélou rightly says that "the O.T. thus appeared as the first stage toward the Incarnation."[2] What was foretold in the Old Testament was also described as a promise which will be accomplished in the New Testament. Again Daniélou writes that "this difference is essentially between the Christ announced and the Christ given."[3]

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.11.1, p. 474. Cf. Matthew 8:17.

[2] Ibid., IV.34.1, p. 511.

Christ is not only foretold in the Old Testament, but He is also born as the descendant of Abraham, in which case we see the Abraham-Christ line. Thus the relationship between the creation and the Incarnation and between the Old Testament and the Incarnation point to the fact that the Incarnation is the climax of the entire human history.[4]

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.14.2, p. 479.

[2] Jean Daniélou, Message Évangélique et Culture Hellénistique Aux IIe et IIIe siecles (Paris: Desclée & Co., 1961), p. 158. My translation from French.

[3] Ibid., p.16. My translation from French.

[4] Cf. Oscar Cullman, Christ and Time (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1950), pp. 137-138. He describes the two lines, namely the Adam-Christ line and the Abraham-Christ line, and concludes that these two lines show how the Old Testament belongs to Christian revelation and how Jesus Christ fulfills the history of His people.

Now we must deal with the purpose of the Incarnation in more specific terms. Irenaeus frequently speaks of the Word's becoming flesh in order to reveal the Father. The Incarnation is the "Incomprehensible [acting thus] by means of the comprehensible, and the Invisible by the visible."[1]

Irenaeus quotes John 1:18 to show that no one hath seen God at any time, but the only begotten Son of God, thus saying that only the Son can reveal the Father.

> Wherefore they know Him to whom the Son reveals Him; and again, the Father, by means of the Son, gives the knowledge of His Son to those who love Him.[2]

The Father cannot be known without the Son and the Son without the Father. So it was a mistake for the Jews to imagine that "they could know the Father [apart] by Himself, without the Word, that is, without the Son."[3] It was not enough for our Master to exist as Word for men to know the Father:

---

[1] *Against Heresies*, III.11.5, p. 427. [ ] in the original. Also see *ibid*., III.9.1, p. 422.

[2] *Ibid*., III.11.6, p. 427.

[3] *Ibid*., IV.7.4, p. 470. [ ] in the original.

> For in no other way could we have learned the things of God, unless our Master, existing as the Word, had become man. For no other being had the power of revealing to us the things of the Father, except His own proper Word. For what other person "knew the mind of the Lord," or who else "has become His counsellor?" Again, we could have learned in no other way than by seeing our Teacher, and hearing His voice with our own ears, that having become imitators of His works as well as doers of His words, we may have communion with Him, receiving increase from the perfect One, and from Him who is prior to all creation.[1]

Certainly it is not difficult to see Christ as the "illuminator" in the thought of Irenaeus.[2] It is a gross mistake, however, if we think that Irenaeus only emphasized the knowledge of God as the purpose of the Incarnation.[3]

---

[1] _Against Heresies_, V.1.1, p. 526.

[2] Many scholars point out that the notion of Christ as "the illuminator" is prominent among the thinkers of the first two centuries. For example, H. E. W. Turner writes, "The interpretation of the redemption which Christ brought primarily in terms of knowledge, and of Christ first and foremost a Teacher, is especially characteristic of the Apostolic Fathers." And he also quotes V.1.1 of _Against Heresies_ to demonstrate the same tendency of thinking in Irenaeus. (_The Patristic Doctrine of Redemption_ /London: A. R. Mowbray & Co., 1952/, p. 33).

[3] Samuel Laeuchli gives an excellent account how the theological language of Irenaeus does not take place within a metaphysical quest but within a response to an act. He writes, "There is, of course, speculative theology regarding God as metaphysical being, as we shall see later; nevertheless, theological language in ever new affirmations revolves around the Incarnate Event (III.21.1). . . . We are not speculating about the eternity of God, but we are confronted with the first Christian axiom: 'How shall man pass into God unless God has passed into Man?' (IV.33.4)." (_op.cit._, pp. 167-168).

As the previous passage we have quoted indicates, one other purpose of the Incarnation was that we might have communion with God. The Incarnation was God's entering into communion with us.

> For it was incumbent upon the Mediator between God and men, by His relationship to both, to bring both to friendship and concord, and present man to God, while He revealed God to man. For, in what way could we be partakers of the adoption of sons, unless we had received from Him through the Son that fellowship which refers to Himself, unless His Word having been made flesh, had entered into communion with us?[1]

Now the logical question for us to ask is why it was necessary for the Word of God to become man in order for us to enter into communion with God.

For Irenaeus the grand purpose of the Incarnation was to combat the root of enmity between God and man. In other words, Irenaeus explicitly states that the purpose of the Incarnation was to destroy sin and in order to destroy sin, it was necessary to defeat the author of sin, the Devil.

> . . .and that His Son was His Word, by whom He founded all things; and that He, in the last times, was made a man among men; that He reformed the human race, but destroyed

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.18.7, p. 448.

> and conquered the enemy of man, and gave His handiwork victory against the adversary.[1]

The Devil was, however, the enemy of man; i.e., it was man whom the Devil tempted and tramped upon. Hence it had to be through a man that the Devil be defeated. At the same time, it was not possible for man to overcome his enemy, because he had been conquered and destroyed by his enemy.[2] This point is well expressed in the following passage:

> Therefore, as I have already said, He caused man (human nature) to cleave to and to become one with God. For unless man had overcome the enemy of man, the enemy would not have been legitimately vanquished. And again: unless it had been God who had freely given salvation, we could never have possessed it securely. And unless man had been joined to God, he could never have become a partaker of incorruptibility.[3]

His overcoming the Devil is for the benefit of humanity[4] and the natural result of defeating the Devil is to conquer all the infirmities that he brings upon men. Thus the Incarnation is God's way of killing sin and of depriving death of its power, bringing true life to men.

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.24.1, p. 495. Also see ibid., V.21.1, p. 548 and V.21.2, p. 549.

[2] Ibid., III.18.2, p. 446.

[3] Ibid., III.18.7, p. 448.

[4] Ibid., III.17.4, p. 445.

> So He united man with God and brought about a communion of God and man, we being unable in any other wise to have part in incorruptibility, had it not been for His coming to us. . . . So the Word was made flesh, in order that sin, destroyed by means of that same flesh through which it had gained the mastery and taken hold and lorded it, should no longer be in us and therefore our Lord took up the same first formation for an Incarnation, that so He might join battle on behalf of His forefathers, and overcome through Adam that had stricken us through Adam.[1]

To overcome all the unnatural results brought forth by the Devil means to make men the sons of God. Thus the Incarnation was God's becoming man to make men His sons.[2]

The Incarnation, then, is God's becoming man in the full sense and dwelling among us. The humanity of the

---

[1] Proof of the Apostolic Preaching, 31, pp. 67-68.

[2] We will deal with this idea of becoming sons of God fully when we discuss the Deification. At this point, however, it is still worth noticing that Athanasius follows Irenaeus very closely in his exposition of the Incarnation. For him indeed one of the chief reasons for the Incarnation was for us to become divine. He writes, "Indeed, nothing less can be said than that he became man so that we might become divine." (op.cit., p. 45).

Incarnate Word is real: Irenaeus stresses that "in every respect, too, He is man, the formation of God; and thus He took up man into Himself."[1] In fact, it was Irenaeus' unswerving conviction that the Word of God took the actual flesh which was the same as ours. This is clearly demonstrated in his refutation of the Gnostic denial of the Word's becoming flesh.[2]

The Gnostic theories in regard to the Word becoming flesh vary widely but Irenaeus concludes that "according to the opinion of no one of the heretics was the Word of God made flesh."[3] Samuel Laeuchli explains how the Gnostics lost the language about Jesus Christ. He writes,

> This Christ has no terrestrial reality of flesh and blood. He is Savior and Redeemer but he does not live as real person. He cannot live because Gnostic language cannot grasp him as living being. Abstraction--yes; hypostasis--indeed. History--never. A historical tale, in which the earth is touched by the hand and feet of a breathing human life, cannot permeate the imagination of the Gnostic. He does not possess the vocabulary in which to re-create the tale. If he knows the vocabulary, he does not live in it. His religious language

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.16.3, p. 443.

[2] Ibid., I.9.3, p. 329.

[3] Ibid., III.11.3, pp. 426-427.

> must place Christ elsewhere.[1]

Laeuchli also gives a penetrating account how the Gnostic language is incapable of communicating the historical reality of Jesus Christ because of its anthropology. He writes,

> When Christ lives for a Gnostic, he lives indeed, but he lives as a mysterious entity, as a fascinating reality of abstraction, or as a revealed theologoumenon. Christ as a man of flesh and blood cannot be meaningful because Gnostic language cannot grasp man as a creature of flesh and spirit in unity.[2]

Combatting all the Gnostic heresies, Irenaeus ardently argues that the eternal Word of God and Jesus of Nazareth are one and the same. Thus between Irenaeus and Gnosticism the religious battle is fought on the central issue: Docetism or Jesus Christ. And Irenaeus keeps the center of Christian faith, namely "the Word of God made flesh."

In his language of Jesus Christ, Irenaeus is already rejecting the adoption theory and strongly maintaining that the historical Jesus, who was born of the root of Jesse, is Christ who is the very Word incarnate. Thus after quoting Matt. 3:16, in which the baptism of Jesus is reported, Irenaeus writes,

---

[1] Laeuchli, op.cit., 74.

[2] Ibid., p. 77.

> For Christ did not at that time descend upon Jesus, neither was Christ one and Jesus another: but the Word of God--who is the Savior of all, and the ruler of heaven and earth, who is Jesus, as I have already pointed out, who did also take upon Him flesh, and was anointed by the Spirit from the Father--was made Jesus Christ, as Esaias also says, "There shall come forth a rod from the root of Jesse, . . .[1]

One of Irenaeus' favorite ways of showing that the humanity of Jesus was real is found in the statements about the virgin birth of Jesus. The Son of God did not become man merely in appearence.[2] He did become man, truly and actually conceived and born of Mary. His descent into Mary points to His true humanity in the sense that He actually partook of her human nature.[3] His earthly life as a man confirms that He is a true human being in every aspect, because He is the man who truly hungers, gets wearied and so needs to rest, becomes exceeding sorrowful and feels pain.[1]

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.9.3, p. 423. The Scripture passage quoted is from Isa. 9:1. Also see ibid., III.16.2, and 3, p. 440-441.

[2] Ibid., II.22.4, p. 391. Irenaeus reports that this is the way the Gnostics describes Him.

[3] Ibid., III.19.3, p. 449.

In fact, Irenaeus not only stresses His birth through Mary, but he also points out the whole human life and the human character of our Lord are an integral part of the plan of salvation. Unlike most of the writers who put stress only on two great events such as the Incarnation and the Cross, Irenaeus shows the importance of every event of Christ's life within the plan of salvation. This is not to say that Irenaeus does not grasp the unique importance of the Incarnation and the Cross, but his purpose is to relate the entire life of Christ to the eternal will of the Father with special emphasis on the Incarnation and the Cross.

The Word of God who became flesh meets every condition of humanity except that of sin; He came to save all by means of Himself. First of all, Irenaeus uses the childhood analogy, saying,

> And for this cause our Lord, in these last times, when He had summed up all things into Himself, came to us, not as He might have come, but as we were capable of beholding Him. He might easily have come to us in

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.22.2, p. 454. Cf. Jn. 4:6, Matt. 26:38.

> His immortal glory, but in that case we could never have endured the greatness of the glory; and therefore it was that He, who was the perfect bread of the Father, offered Himself to us as milk, because we were as infants.[1]

Thus explaining how the Word came to us so that we could behold Him, Irenaeus depicts beautifully how He meets every condition of humanity.

> Being a Master, therefore, He also possessed the age of a Master, not despising or evading any condition of humanity, nor setting aside in Himself that law which He had appointed for the human race, but sanctifying every age, by that period corresponding to it which belonged to Himself. For He came to save all through means of Himself--all, I say, who through Him are born again to God--infants, and children, and boys, and youths, and old men. He therefore passed through every age, becoming an infant for infants, thus sanctifying infants; a child for children, thus sanctifying those who are of this age, being at the same time made to them an example of piety, righteousness, and submission; a youth for youths, becoming an example to youths, and thus sanctifying them for the Lord. . . . Then, at last, He came to death itself, that He might be "the first-born from the dead, that in all things He might have the pre-eminence," the prince of life, existing before all, and going before all.[2]

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.38.1, p. 521.

[2] Ibid., II.22.4, p. 391. The Latin text in Harvey's edition for the "who through Him are born again to God--infants" is "qui per eum renascuntur in Deum, infantes." Harvey remarks that this testimony is a valuable record of fact as regards the primitive baptism of infants. (op.cit., Vol. I, p. 330).

Then as Lawson puts it, the Incarnate Lord was "above all a Champion, who wrought out human salvation by a life of moral travail."[1] Lawson rightly points out that at this point Irenaeus far excels many of the most honored Fathers of the Church. In order to show the validity of this statement, he compares Irenaeus with Athanasius, saying,

> Like Irenaeus, Athanasius wrote to vindicate the Incarnation of God the Son as the necessary foundation for and central fact in a Gospel of Redemption. . . . The bare fact of Incarnation was all that was necessary to work the salvation of man, presumably because the salvation of the world was conceived of as a semi-mechanical inoculation of humanity with the Divine.[2]

Our concern is not to see if Lawson is entirely right, but in any case we can agree with him that Irenaeus is more advanced in grasping the importance of the historical Jesus than Athanasius. Here again Irenaeus manages to combine the two aspects of the Incarnation as the victory over the Devil and the sanctification of men in every stage.

We are grossly mistaken, however, if we think that Irenaeus' emphasis on the human nature of Christ through His birth and His actual life leads us to conclude that the Son of man and man as such are actually the same. The humanity which Christ discloses is what man ought to be, but it is never what man actually is. It is for this reason that Irenaeus does not argue in terms of Christ's taking upon Him sinful humanity. To say that Christ was fully human does not mean that we are like Christ. Christ can be fully human because He is God; but man cannot be fully human in the same sense that Christ is, because man cannot be God. There is a wide gap between the Son of God and the actual man or existential man.

---

[1] Lawson, op.cit., p. 154.

[2] Ibid., pp. 153-154.

For Irenaeus it was not conceivable to think of the humanity of Christ apart from His divinity. In the Incarnation what is disclosed is perfect God and perfect man.[1] This is the double aspect of the Incarnation. It is interesting to note that Irenaeus uses the virgin birth to show both sides of the Incarnation. We have already indicated that Irenaeus argued his doctrine of the Word assuming actual flesh on the basis of the virgin birth of Jesus Christ.[2]

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.16, p. 440.

[2] Supra, p. 196.

He also bases the divinity of Christ on the fact of the virgin birth, arguing that He was not a mere man begotten from Joseph in the ordinary course of the nature; He was very God because He was begotten of the Father most high and He was very man born of the virgin.[1]

Thus as he rebuked those who say that He was not a perfect man, Irenaeus also rebuked those who say that He was simply a mere man. He writes,

> But again, those who assert that He was simply a mere man, begotten by Joseph, remaining in the bondage of the old disobedience, are in a state of death; having been not as yet joined to the Word of God the Father, nor receiving liberty through the Son, as He does Himself declare: "If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." But, being ignorant of Him who from the Virgin is Emmanuel, they are deprived of His gift, which is eternal life; and not receiving the incorruptible Word, they remain in motal flesh, and are debtors to death, not obtaining the antidote of life.[2]

Irenaeus did not question that it was the divine Word, the very God, who was incarnate in Jesus and that nothing less was adequate if He were to be man's Savior. Thus he already grasped this basic truth which became the common ground of all opponents of Arianism.

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.19, p. 448.

[2] Ibid., III.19.1, p. 448. Cf. Jn. 8:36, Rom. 6:23.

In Irenaeus we also find a strong foundation of the Chalcedonian doctrine, because what he was emphasizing was the unity of Christ in His Incarnation. Thus scholars like Andre Benoit witness to this point strongly. Benoit notes;

> He treated with precision the unity of Christ in the Incarnation, which was the object of the great Christological debates in the posteriority.[1]

To sum up, the Incarnation is the culmination of God's saving act, which is mystery incomprehensible to angels, because it is the Son's accomplishing of the Father's will.[2] The Incarnation is God's stooping down to lift up men so that men can be truly men.[3]

---

[1] Benoit, op.cit., p. 207.

[2] Against Heresies, V.36.3, p. 567.

[3] When Anders Nygren argues that the idea of the Incarnation in Irenaeus is strongly theocentric, he makes an interesting observation on the doctrine of the Incarnation in Irenaeus in comparison with the Gnostic teaching. He writes, "It is easy to see why Irenaeus just at this point is so bitterly opposed to the Gnostics. He and they have two diametrically opposed conceptions, two different ways of salvation. Gnosticism teaches the ascent of the soul to the Deity, Irenaeus the descent of God to lost humanity; Gnosticism teaches in the last resort self-salvation, Irenaeus that salvation in its entirety is a work of God; the way of salvation in Gnosticism is the way of Eros, in Irenaeus it is the way of Agape." (Agape and Eros, trans. by Philip S. Watson [London: S. P. C. K., 1953], p. 400).

2. The Cross

For Irenaeus the Cross is the ultimate sign of God's love expressed in His suffering as Man. Precisely because the suffering depicted on the Cross is that of the man bearing human suffering on His back, it is on the Cross that the love of God reaches a climax.

Scholars like Beuzart accuse Irenaeus of minimizing the importance of the redemptive death of the Son by putting too much emphasis on the Incarnation.[1] Aulén also points out that scholars like Bonwetsch hold the view that the Cross and with it the Resurrection hold no central place in Irenaeus' thought.[2] This kind of criticism is due to their inability to see the inseparable relationship between the Incarnation and the Cross in the thought of Irenaeus.

For Irenaeus Christ's redeeming death is by no means a mere appendage to the Incarnation. Rather it is the fulfillment of the purpose of the Incarnation. If we do not see a definite continuity between the Incarnation and the Cross in his scheme of thought, we are missing the essential point. Irenaeus does not fail to indicate that it is the same Word of God who was incarnate that underwent the suffering on the Cross. We find passages where the Passion and the fact of the Incarnation are used together.

---

[1] Beuzart writes, "The Incarnation thus plays a major role in the Christology and the soteriology of Irenaeus. This doctrine occupies a more important place than that of the redemption. . . . Irenaeus sees the abasement, the humiliation and the sacrifice of the Son of God, at the point of departure of His earthly existence." (op.cit., p. 93).

[2] Aulén, op.cit., p. 29.

> Learn, then, ye foolish men, that Jesus who suffered for us, and who dwelt among us, is Himself the Word of God.[1]

Any emphasis Irenaeus puts on the Incarnation also falls on the Cross, because they belong to one plan of God, i.e., the salvation of man. We have already indicated that it was a great contribution of Irenaeus that he gave importance to every aspect of the historical life of Jesus. If he gives great weight to every aspect of Christ's life, relating the significance of it to the Incarnation, it is hardly conceivable for anyone to think that the death of Christ is treated as of quite secondary importance by him. The death is the culmination of the life of the incarnate Lord, because it is through death that men are brought to life, i.e., to Resurrection. Certainly the Crucifixion marked for Irenaeus the consummation of the Incarnation, but parenthetically we can also mention that perhaps the death of Christ does not receive the exclusive attention by Irenaeus simply because he also pays attention to other aspects of Christ's life as an inter-related whole.

---

[1] Against Heresies, I.9.3, p. 329. Cf. ibid., III.18.3, p. 446.

The entire life of Christ is treated as a continous process of victorious conflict, but it is on the Cross that His conflict becomes most intense and His victory most glorious, because it is on the Cross that the love of God reaches a climax in the Suffering of the Son. We observe that Irenaeus is very much concerned that the suffering of Jesus was real, against the Gnostic contention that it was imaginary.[1] And it was Jesus Christ who suffered for us, "the Son of God having been made the Son of Man," because "the impassible Christ did not descend upon Jesus."[2]

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.18, pp. 446-448.

[2] Ibid., III.18.3, p. 446 and III.11.7, p. 428.

The reason why Irenaeus was so anxious to demonstrate that the suffering of Jesus was real, of course, was his desire to refute the heretical teachings of the Gnostics. At the same time, however, he gives a significant theological meaning to the suffering of Jesus on the Cross. In the suffering on the Cross, the Son of God plainly demonstrated that He did not escape the pain of being human. The suffering on the Cross was an ultimate kind of human suffering and it was real; Jesus suffered fully, really, and painfully. He had the human desire to evade the cup of suffering. Moreover, He had a chance to evade it because as Irenaeus specifically points out, He had known that He would suffer.[1]

Irenaeus is well aware of the vicarious suffering that Christ underwent. The suffering of Christ was not for Himself, but for our sake. Irenaeus quotes many passages from the book of Isaiah such as Isa. 52:13-53[2] and Isa. 53:5[3] as he writes, "and despise Him not for the sufferings which He deliberately underwent for thy sake."[1] His suffering was for the sake of men, and that is precisely how the love of God and the suffering on the Cross are interlocked. He who suffered for the sake of men is "a most holy and merciful Lord, and loves the human race."[2]

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.18.4, p. 447.

[2] Proof of the Apostolic Preaching, 68, p. 92.

[3] Ibid., 69, p. 92.

On the Cross we also find the living culmination of the ethics of love. Irenaeus writes,

> And from this fact, that He exclaimed upon the cross, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," the long suffering, patience, compassion, and goodness of Christ are exhibited, since He both suffered, and did Himself exculpate those who had maltreated Him.[3]

He not only showed how much God loves the human race, but also gave the prime example of His ethics of love. Again Irenaeus makes this point clear when he writes,

> For the Word of God, who said to us, "Love your enemies, and pray for those who hate you," Himself did this very thing upon the cross; loving the human race to such a degree, that He even prayed for those putting Him to death.[4]

---

[1] Proof of the Apostolic Preaching, 70, p. 93.

[2] Against Heresies, III.18.6, pp. 447-448.

[3] Ibid., III.18.5, p. 447. Scripture passage Lk. 23:34.

[4] Ibid., III.18.5, p. 447. Scripture passage Matt. 5:44.

Thus on the Cross we find the purest human being that has ever existed and that will ever exist, because it was our Lord as Man who embodied the highest form of the ethics of love through His humility and obedience unto death.

Now we must consider why the Son of Man had to suffer in the first place. We have emphasized that it was God's suffering as Man. Irenaeus makes an analogy between the tree of disobedience and the tree of obedience, saying that in order for that disobedience to be undone, the obedience on the Cross was necessary. Thus after discussing the purpose of the Incarnation, Irenaeus writes,

> And not by the aforesaid things alone has the Lord manifested Himself, but [He has done this] also by means of His passion. For doing away with [the effects of] that disobedience of man which had taken place at the beginning by the occasion of a tree, "He became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross;" rectifying that disobedience which had occurred by reason of a tree, through that obedience which was [wrought out] upon the tree of the cross.[1]

---

[1] *Against Heresies*, V.16.3, p. 544. Scripture passage Phil. 2:8. [ ] in the original.

He makes the same analogy again in the Proof of the Apostolic Preaching:

> And the sin that was wrought through the tree was undone by the obedience of the tree, obedience to God whereby the Son of man was nailed to the tree, destroying the knowledge of evil, and bringing in and conferring the knowledge of good; and evil is disobedience to God, as obedience to God is good.[1]

The obedience unto death was necessary because of the disobedience of man in the beginning. In this sense the death of Christ was the atonement for man's sin. In the act of atonement, two things are done, i.e., doing away with the origin of man's sin and forgiveness of man's sin.

Christ as the Victor on the Cross is very strong theme in the thought of Irenaeus, because what is implied here is His undoing the work of the Devil. At this point, we must ask if Irenaeus is advocating the so-called "ransom" theory. We are familiar with the teaching of Origen that the death of Christ was the ransom paid to Satan, who had attained rights over man by the Fall. Do we have this notion in Irenaeus? Scholars such as Hitchcock find it almost impossible to trace the ransom theory in the thought of Irenaeus.[1] On the other hand, Aulén writes,

---

[1] The Proof of the Apostolic Preaching, 34, p. 69.

> But at the same time, Irenaeus also exhibits the righteousness of God's redemptive work, by showing that in it He does not use mere external compulsion, mere brute force, but acts altogether according to justice. . . . Irenaeus shrinks from the assertion which some of the later Fathers are prepared to make, that the devil has gained in the last resort, certain actual rights over man; he is restrained by his sense of the importance of maintaining, against the Gnostics, that the devil is a robber and a usurper. Yet the underlying idea is present: the "apostasy" of mankind involves guilt, and man deserves to lie under the devil's power.[2]

Aulén seems to want to prove two points: (a) God's justice which deals fairly even with the Devil and (b) man's responsibility for being tempted by the Devil. There is some truth in his position, but it is hard to establish a ransom theory solely on the basis of the Devil's power over man.

---

[1] Hitchcock writes, "There is no trace, however, of Origen's idea that a ransom was paid by way of compensation to the Evil One by the Savior--an error in which Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory the Great were drawn by the speculations of Origen. For he did not regard the Evil One as having a claim over the human race, or the Atonement as being a transaction between God and the Evil One. The debt which was owed, but which Christ did not owe, was to the eternal law of holiness." (R. R. M. Hitchcock, *Irenaeus of Lugdunum* [Cambridge: at the University Press, 1914], p. 168.

[2] Aulén, *op.cit.*, pp. 27-28.

We have already noticed that Irenaeus vehemently argued that Christ had the right to gain back what was lost by the apostasy of the Evil One whereas the Devil did not have any right to tempt man. Once we deny the right of the Devil over man, it becomes very hard to see the necessity for the Victor to pay the ransom to the one who would be defeated. Perhaps very little hint of the ransom theory is in Irenaeus in the sense that Christ defeated Satan with His death, but we can hardly establish a ransom theory exclusively on Satan's right over man.

Rather, the stronger idea in Irenaeus is that Christ paid the debt (which is identified with sin in Irenaeus), to the Father. He relates paying back the debt with reconciling men to God. Thus he writes,

> In the second Adam, however, we are reconciled, being made obedient unto death. For we were debtors to none other but to Him whose commandment we had transgressed at the beginning.[1]

Christ's reconciling action is also described as "propitiating indeed for us the Father against whom we had sinned, and cancelling (consolatus), our disobedience by His own obedience."[1]

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.16.3, p. 544.

In this kind of passage, then, do we get a hint of a juridical atonement which took its rise in the West and was most clearly expounded by Anselm in the Medieval Age? There is little trace in Irenaeus of the ideas of propitiatio and satisfactio in the same sense as they appear in Anselm's later theory of atonement. For Irenaeus, propitiating to the Father does not mean to compensate for the infinite offense of sin and to release men from legal penalties and pains of sin; it means to reconcile men to God by defeating the Evil One who was the very cause of the enmity between God and men. In other words, the reconcilation is between God and men, but Christ's reconciling work involves the Devil's defeat.

Christ overcame the Devil, who caused the disobedience of man, by His own obedience as man; in this sense His suffering was a real suffering of man. At the same time, His victory over the Devil was possible only because He was God as well as man. This is also to say that Christ could be a perfect man only because He was God at the same time. It is God Himself who reconciles men to God. In this sense, Aulén is right when he says that "God is both the Reconciler and the Reconciled."[1] Hitchcock also observes with keen insight when he compares Anselm and Irenaeus in the following manner:

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.17.1, p. 544.

> Another great difference lies in the relation in which the Father and the Son are represented as standing to One Another in regard to the redemption of mankind. This relation in Anselm is represented as forensic, mechanical, and external. But in Irenaeus the manner in which the Father and the Son cooperate in the Atonement, reveals a spiritual intimacy and a mystical union between these Divine Persons.[2]

For Irenaeus the real motive of the atonement was to express God's love for men. The atoning work of Christ flows from His love that would not allow men to be possessions of the Devil. Irenaeus writes,

> And justly indeed is he led captive who had led men unjustly into bondage; while man, who had been led captive in times past, was rescued from the grasp of his possessor, according to the tender mercy of God the Father, who had compassion on His own handiwork, and gave it salvation, restoring it by means of the Word--that is by Christ--in order that men might learn by actual

---

[1] Aulén, op.cit., p. 30.

[2] Hitchcock, op.cit., p. 176.

> proof that he receives incorruptibility not of himself, but by the free gift of God.[1]

In the atoning work of Christ, we also find the idea of the forgiveness of man's sin. Had not God forgiven the sin of man, or rather had not God loved man enough to forgive his sin, He would not have taken up the human suffering on the Cross to overcome the Evil One for the purpose of healing man. For Irenaeus healing man naturally involves remitting sins; "Therefore, by remitting sins, He did indeed heal man, while He also manifested Himself who He was."[2] In order to show that the Cross is the real atonement for our sins, Irenaeus quotes St. Paul: "'Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth upon a tree.'"[3]

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.21.3, p. 550. Also see ibid., V.2.1, p. 528. He writes, "As far as concerned the apostasy, indeed He redeems us righteously from it by His own blood; but as regards us who have been redeemed, [He does this] graciously. For we have given nothing to Him previously, nor does He desire anything from us, as if He stood in need of it; but we do stand in need of fellowship with Him. And for this reason it was that He graciously poured Himself out, that He might gather us into the bosom of the Father." [ ] in the original.

[2] Ibid., V.17.3, p. 545.

[3] Ibid., III.18.3, p. 446. Scripture passage Gal. 3:13. Cf. III.16.3, p. 444.

At this point, it is interesting to compare Irenaeus with Abelard, because Abelard also explained the Cross in terms of God's love. Despite the similiar tone in this aspect, Irenaeus goes far beyond Abelard. For Irenaeus Christ's death was not only effective through its exemplary value, as it was for Abelard, but it was also effective through the objective victory of Christ over the Devil. In other words, in Irenaeus we already have a beginning of the theory of the atonement held by Abelard, but that of Irenaeus is much more inclusive, because he manages to hold both the objective and subjective view of the atonement. We should not say, however, that Irenaeus combined Anselm and Abelard, because as we have already seen, Irenaeus' objective theory of atonement is different from that of Anselm.

To sum up, we may conclude that Irenaeus presents Jesus as the purest human being on the Cross, who overcame the disobedience of man with obedience unto death and humility, and as the Victor over the Evil One. This is the incarnate Lord in whom was the perfect image of God in which all men were created. On the Cross Christ shows us how we can attain the image of God, i.e., true humanity, by taking the form of a servant, emptying Himself. The love of God reaches a climax on the Cross, because it is there that man encounters God who does not refuse the pain of being human, and overcomes the enemy of man, the Devil, for the sake of man.

3. Resurrection

The death of Jesus on the Cross was man's death. It was sealed with obedience, thereby doing away with the power of the Devil and God's wrath. And the death on the Cross was to bring God's life, but that life was realized only in the Resurrection of Christ. The death on the Cross and the life realized in the Resurrection were inseparable because one was impossible without the other. In order to demonstrate this, Irenaeus quotes St. Paul and states his point thus.

> But again, showing that Christ did suffer, and was Himself the Son of God, who died for us, and redeemed us with His blood at the time appointed beforehand, he says: "For how is it, that Christ, when we were yet without strength, in due time died for the ungodly? But God commendeth His love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more, then, being

> now justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son; much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by His life." He declares in the plainest manner, that the same Being who was laid hold of, and underwent suffering, and shed His blood for us, was both Christ and the Son of God, who did also rise again, and was taken up into the heaven, . . .[1]

Irenaeus was very keenly aware of the significance of the Resurrection as Christ's conquest of death and entrance into His glory. This significance is shown by the way in which the Passion of Christ and the Resurrection are inseparably connected.

For Irenaeus, the Resurrection of Christ was the surest example of the final victory over death; and His Resurrection was a proof of ours. The Resurrection of Christ points to our resurrection and at the same time it is Christ Himself who will raise us up. Then it naturally follows that in the way that Christ rose, we shall also rise. All these ideas are well expressed in the following passage:

> In the same manner, therefore, as Christ did rise in the substance of flesh, and

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.16.9, p. 444. Scripture passage Rom. 5:6-10.

> pointed out to His disciples the mark of the nails and the opening in His side (now these are the tokens of the flesh which rose from the dead), "shall He also," it is said, "raise us up by His own power."[1]

Based on the fact that Christ did rise in the substance of the flesh, Irenaeus goes on to emphasize the resurrection of our flesh. To affirm that the death on the Cross was man's death makes it feasible to affirm the bodily Resurrection of Christ, because the body that rose was that same body in the tomb. Irenaeus stresses that Jesus Christ who suffered for us is "He, who lay in the tomb, and rose again, who descended and ascended,--the Son of God having been made the Son of man."[2] Precisely because Christ who suffered and rose again gives us strength, our resurrection also becomes possible. Thus Irenaeus writes,

> But the Lord, our Christ, underwent a valid, and not merely accidental passion; not only was He Himself not in danger of being destroyed, but He also established fallen man by His own strength, and recalled Him to incorruption.[3]

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.5.7, p. 532. Scripture passage I Cor. 6:14.

[2] Ibid., III.18.3, p. 446.

[3] Ibid., II.20.3, p. 388.

To deny the resurrection of our flesh is to deny the power of God, because it is precisely the power of God that makes it possible for us to attain our life. To deny the resurrection is to deny God's life bestowing power and to deny the victory over death. What else could be the result of the victory over death, but life? If death is something unnatural and a destructive power, the Resurrection of Christ means the restoration of life. In this sense, Christ's Resurrection is not something exclusively supernatural. Therefore, it becomes only natural for us to see the prime example of our resurrection in that of Christ. The difference is that we cannot be the cause of our own resurrection, whereas Christ is the cause of ours as well as His. This is also to say that in the Resurrection we again see our Lord who is a perfect man and perfect God. At the same time, to say that Christ enables our resurrection is one of the excellent ways of maintaining God's transcendence, because it is "from the excelling power of this Being [God], not from our own nature" that we become to possess the eternal duration.[1]

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.2.3, p. 528. [ ] in the original.

Once again in his presentation of the Resurrection, Irenaeus manages to relate God the Creator and God the Redeemer as the bestower of eternal life. In this case, it becomes perfectly possible to indicate the contradiction of the Gnostics when they deny the resurrection of the flesh.[1] It was inconceivable to deny the participation of the flesh in life, because the flesh was also created by God and was thus inalienable from God's power. The very fact of our present existence can be a basis of the participation of the flesh in life. To speak of the incapacity of the flesh to receive the life bestowed by God is the same as saying that we are dead men. This also leads us to see the consistency with his basic belief in man as unity. Thus argues Irenaeus,

> But if they are now alive, and if their whole body partakes of life, how can they venture the assertion that the flesh is not qualified to be a partaker of life, when they do confess that they have life at the present moment? It is just as if anybody were to take up a sponge full of water, or a torch on fire, and to declare that the sponge could not possibly

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.1.2, p. 528. On the basis of Christ's resurrected body who possessed flesh and blood, Irenaeus points out the mistake of Valentinians when they exclude the flesh from salvation.

> partake of the water, or the torch of the fire. In this very manner do those men, by alleging that they are alive and bear life about in their members, contradict themselves afterwards, when they represent these members as not being capable of [receiving] life.[1]

Then he compares our present temporal life with eternal life in such a way that the participation of the flesh in incorruption in the eternal life cannot be otherwise but possible in the following fashion:

> But if the present temporal life, which is of such an inferior nature to eternal life, can nevertheless effect so much as to quicken our mortal bodies, why should not eternal life, being much more powerful than this, vivify the flesh, which has already held converse with, and been accustomed to sustain, life?[2]

Finally it is one God the Creator and the Redeemer who infuses life and sustains life and bestows eternal life.

> For that the flesh can really partake of life, is shown from the fact of its being alive; for it lives on, as long as it is God's purpose that it should do so. It is manifest, too, that God has the power to confer life upon it, inasmuch as He grants life to us who are in existence. And,

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.3.3, pp. 529-530; [ ] in the original.

[2] Ibid., V.3.3, p. 530.

> therefore, since the Lord has power to infuse life into what He has fashioned, and since the flesh is capable of being quickened, what remains to prevent its participating in incorruption, which is a blissful and never-ending life granted by God?[1]

Life after the resurrection is eternal and blissful, because it is the life after the victory over death, and yet it is no more a miracle than the creation, if not less. It is impossible to deny the resurrection of the body and the eternal life bestowed by God when we become aware of the power and wisdom that brought creation.

> But that He is powerful in all these respects, we ought to perceive from our origin, inasmuch as God, taking dust from the earth, formed man. And surely it is much more difficult and incredible, from non-existent bones, and nerves, and veins, and the rest of man's organization, to bring it about that all this should be, and to make man an animated and rational creature, than to reintegrate again which had been created and then afterwards decomposed into earth (for the reasons already mentioned), having thus passed into those [elements] from which man, who had no previous existence was formed. For He who in the beginning caused him to have being who as yet was not, just when He pleased, shall much more reinstate again those who had a former

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.3.3, p. 530.

> existence, when it is His will [that they should inherit the life granted by Him].[1]

By putting such an emphatic stress on the resurrection of the body, Irenaeus is also maintaining that the full redeemed life will include a whole man, who was created by God to remain an embodied spirit. Furthermore, the life after death is not due to the inherently immortal nature of man's soul, but it is wholly the gift of God.[2] Thus rejecting the Greek doctrine of the immortality of the soul and the continuance of the essential personality without a body, Irenaeus maintains that our eternal life does not come from our own nature. It is the Word of God who grants us the resurrection through Eucharist[1] "to the glory of God, even the Father, who freely gives to this mortal immortality, and to this corruptible incorruption."[2]

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.3.2, p. 529. It is worth noticing how much Oscar Cullman and Irenaeus agree in their interpretation of creation and resurrection. They both see an inseparable relationship between creation and resurrection. Cullman writes, "A miracle of God was necessary if there was to be resurrection; a miracle of creation by the omnipotent, life-giving God. The resurrection presupposes the faith in creation. Because God is the creator also of the body, therefore in the Bible "resurrection," in opposition to Hellenism, must be resurrection of the body." (op.cit., p. 234).

Also notice what Bonhoeffer has to say: "But the God of the creation and of the real beginning is, at the same time, the God of the resurrection. . . . The dead Jesus Christ of Good Friday--and the resurrected κύριος of Easter Sunday: that is creation out of nothing, creation from the beginning. The fact that Christ was dead did not mean the possibility of the resurrection, but its impossibility; it was the void itself, it was the nihil negativum." (op.cit., p. 16).

[2] In Hitchcock's comparative study of Irenaeus and Theophilus of Antioch, he points out that in Irenaeus immortality is always a gift of God, given προῖκα, whereas in Theophilus it is a μισθός. (op.cit., p. 257).

To know that our eternal life is the gift of God is also to let God be God and let us remain men, which is well stated by Irenaeus:

> . . . but learning by experience that we possess eternal duration from the excelling power of this Being, not from our own nature, we may neither undervalue that glory which surrounds God as He is, nor be ignorant of our own nature, but that we may know what can effect, and what benefits man receives, and thus never wander from the true comprehension of things as they are, that is, both with regard to God and with regard to man.[3]

We have God's promise that He will bestow upon us eternal life in the risen Christ. In other words, all our resurrection hope is founded on the Resurrection of Christ. In that sense, our hope is in the past, but our realized hope belongs to the future. The fulfillment of man's creation will not be realized until the resurrection of the dead and the consummation of all things. At the same time, however, it is the same Lord who rules the life of Creation, Salvation, and the Resurrection.

---

[1] *Infra*, p.

[2] *Against Heresies*, V.2.3, p. 528.

[3] *Ibid*., V.2.3, p. 528.

Thus the full meaning of the Resurrection can only be understood as the risen Lord leads us toward that future, and the power of the Resurrection is operative in the present in the Church. Therefore with the risen Lord in whom we see our future, we go into His Church where the power of the Resurrection is operative.

To conclude this chapter, we may say that Christ as our Incarnate Lord, Crucified Lord, and the Resurrected Lord demonstrated the perfect and the purest human being. Yet in him we encounter God who is the Lord of our past, present and future.

CHAPTER VI

MAN IN THE CHURCH

1. Body of Christ

The eschatological insight of Irenaeus and his emphasis on Christ event lead him to speak of the Church as existing "in between times." For Irenaeus, therefore, the entrance to life is the Church; so he writes that "she is the entrance to life; all others are thieves and robbers."[1] This is because she is "the great and glorious body of Christ."[2] To say that the Church is the body of Christ also means that Christ is not only the Lord of the past but also of the future, because Christ was made the head of the Church in order to carry out His redeeming work until the end of the world. Thus Irenaeus writes,

> . . . so that as in super-celestial, spiritual and invisible things, the Word of God is supreme, so also in the things visible and corporeal He might possess the supremacy, and taking to Himself the pre-eminence, as well as constituting Himself Head of the Church

---

[1] *Against Heresies*, III.4.1, p. 417.

[2] *Ibid.*, IV.33.7, p. 508.

> He might draw all things to Himself at the proper time.[1]

The life of the risen Lord is entrusted to the members of the Church, because He is the head of the Church and gives the gift of life to His body, i.e., to His members. Thus to belong to the Church means to receive the life of the head. In other words, to belong to the Church means to be included in the proper dispensation of God's plan of salvation and to attain the means of the communion with Christ who is the source of life.[2]

The Church is endowed with many qualities such as "sympathy, compassion and steadfastness, and truth," and "they are all "for the aid and encouragement of mankind" without charge.[3] Furthermore, God bestows countless graces through the Church. "It is not possible," writes Irenaeus, "to name the number of the gifts which the Church [scattered] throughout the whole world, has received from God, in the name of Jesus Christ."[4] And since "she has received freely from God, freely also does she minister [to others]."[1]

---

[1] *Against Heresies*, III.16.6, p. 443.

[2] *Ibid.*, III.24.1, p. 458.

[3] *Ibid.*, II.31.3, p. 407.

[4] *Ibid.*, II.32.4, p. 409. [ ] in the original.

Endowed with many gifts of God, the Church is the sole repository of the truth. Irenaeus emphasizes that the truth which the Church has is consistent everywhere, because regardless of where the Church is, her proclamation is about one God and about one faith inherited from the apostles. The classical text is the following:

> The Church, though dispersed throughout the whole world, even to the ends of the earth, has received from the apostles and their disciples this faith: [She believes] in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all things that are in them; and in one Christ Jesus, the Son of God, who became incarnate for our salvation; and in the Holy Spirit, who proclaimed through the prophets the dispensations of God, and the advents, and the birth from a virgin, and the passion, and the resurrection from the dead, and the ascension into heaven in the flesh of the beloved Christ Jesus, our Lord, and His [future] manifestation from heaven in the glory of the Father "to gather all things in one," . . .[2]

For Irenaeus to say that the Church is the sole repository of the truth is the same as saying that the Church is the sole fountain of life. It is inconceivable to have life without this truth which is consistent everywhere. Thus the importance of receiving this canon of truth can hardly be over-emphasized. At this point, however, we must realize that Irenaeus' equation of ἀλήθεια and ἐκκλησία does not necessarily mean an expression of fact, but as Laeuchli so aptly puts it, "the theological demand to take seriously the ἀλήθεια which the ἐκκλησία preserves and maintains, i.e., the canon and the creed."[1] Lauechli states further:

---

[1] *Against Heresies*, II.32.4, p. 409. [ ] in the original.

[2] *Ibid*., I.10.1, p. 330. [ ] in the original. Also see *ibid*., III.24.1, p. 458.

> To possess a creed and canon somewhere in the cupboard of tradition does not make this creed and canon a meaningful axis of faith; unless communication utters the Christocentric language, it cannot radiate its faith. Irenaeus draws the conclusion from what lies embedded in the primitive Christian tradition and brings it to life; this is, however, a theological claim rather than a statement of fact concerning the "the church as body of Christ."[2]

Irenaeus seems to identify this canon of truth with the baptismal creed, because he writes that we receive it in baptism. When Irenaeus is pointing out various mistakes that the Gnostics made by twisting scattered passages from the Scripture, he makes two points:

---

[1] Laeuchli, op.cit., p. 208.

[2] Ibid., p. 208.

first, that he who has the rule of truth will not make the same mistakes as the Gnostics and second, that the truth was received by means of baptism.

> In like manner he also who retains unchangeable in his heart the rule of the truth which he received by means of baptism, will doubtless recognize the names, the expressions, and the parables taken from the Scriptures, but will by no means acknowledge the blasphemous use which these men make of them.[1]

Those who are incoporated into the Church receive the rule of truth by means of baptism. This is also to say that in order to be incoporated into the Church one has to be baptized. The content of the baptismal creed consists of the three articles of the faith, namely, God the Father, the Son of God, and the Holy Spirit.

> And this is the drawing-up of our faith, the foundation of the building, and the consolidation of a way of life. God, the Father, uncreated, beyond grasp, invisible, one God the maker of all; this is the first and foremost article of our faith. But the second article is the Word of God, the Son of God, Christ Jesus our Lord, . . . And the third article is the Holy Spirit, through whom the prophets prophesied and the patriarchs were taught about God and the just were led in the path of justice, and who in the end of times has been poured

---

[1] Against Heresies, I.9.4, p. 330. In this case baptism refers to the adult baptism.

> forth in a new manner upon humanity over all the earth renewing man to God.[1]

For Irenaeus to be baptized means to become man, because the baptism is the "seal of eternal life and is rebirth unto God."

> Now, this is what faith does for us, as the elders, the disciples of the apostles, have handed down to us. First of all, it admonishes us to remember that we have received baptism for remission of sins in the name of God the Father, and in the name of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who became incarnate and died and was raised, and in the Holy Spirit of God; and that this baptism is the seal of eternal life and is rebirth unto God, that we be no more children of mortal men, but of the eternal and everlasting God; . . .[2]

Baptism is the re-entrance to the life which started at the creation and it is the beginning of the life eternal that will be fulfilled in the final resurrection. This is no less than saying that to be baptized means to be re-created in the image and likeness of God and to be put back into the process of growing toward human perfection.

To receive baptism for the remission of sins means to participate in the new creation by being born again in Christ who freed mankind from the subjection of the unnatural lord, the Evil One. Indeed, the sacrament of baptism is ἡ δύναμις τῆς ἀναγεννήσεως εἰς θεόν.[1] In order to become no less than a human, everybody has to be born again to God through Christ, because only Christ can undo what was done through the Fall of man. It is in this sense that Irenaeus suggested infant baptism when he writes,

---

[1] Proof of the Apostolic Preaching, 6, p. 51. Cf. Against Heresies, IV.33.7, p. 508 and I.10.1, p. 330. Also see J. N. D. Kelly, Early Christian Creeds (New York: David Mckay Company, 1950), pp. 77-80.

[2] Proof of the Apostolic Preaching, 3, p. 49.

> For He came to save all through means of Himself--all, I say, who through Him are born again to God--infants, and children, and boys, and youths, and old men.[2]

His emphasis on person and work of Christ is such that in baptism as elsewhere it is Christ who saves man, not man who saves himself. Hence he advocates infant baptism since human will plays a secondary part in the economy of salvation.

Baptism with its two-fold reference, to the past and to the future, does not have its fulfillment in the present. Only in the final resurrection from the dead does baptism come to its fulfillment. Baptism as the entrance to life is the beginning of a long journey toward perfection.

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.17.1, p. 444, I.21.1, p. 345.

[2] Ibid., II.22.4, p. 391.

Even after baptism, man need to continue his spiritual and regenerated life which he commenced in baptism.

If baptism is the entrance to life, the eucharist is a sacrament in which the new life that commenced in baptism is continued. For Irenaeus, receiving the eucharist is encountering the risen Lord, thus joining His incorruptibility. Refuting the Gnostic and docetic rejection of the Lord's real humanity and the resurrection of our flesh, Irenaeus develops an impressive view on the eucharist which combines soteriological and cosmological aspects. In his doctrine of the eucharist, he again manages to associate the redemption with the creation of the world.

> But vain in every respect are they who despise the entire dispensation of God, and disallow the salvation of the flesh, and treat with contempt its regeneration, maintaining that it is not capable of incorruption. But if this indeed do not attain salvation, then neither did the Lord redeem us with His blood, nor is the cup of the Eucharist the communion of His blood, nor the bread which we break the`communion of His body. For blood can only come from veins and flesh, and whatsoever else makes up the substance of man, such as the Word of God was actually made. By His own blood He redeemed us, . . . And as we are His members, we are also nourished by means of the creation (and He Himself grants the creation to us, for He causes His sun to rise

> and sends rain when He wills). He has acknowledged the cup (which is part of the creation) as His own blood, from which He bedews our blood; and the bread (also a part of the creation) He has established as His body, from which He gives increase to our bodies.[1]

In this passage Irenaeus applies very powerful language and maintains that the bread and wine are really the Lord's body and blood. Thus he says that the bread after consecration is no longer the common bread.

> Then, again, how can they say that the flesh, which is nourished with the body of the Lord and with His blood goes to corruption, and does not partake of life? . . . But our opinion is in accordance with the Eucharist, and the Eucharist in turn establishes our opinion. For we offer to Him His own, announcing consistently the fellowship and union of the flesh and the Spirit. For as the bread, which is produced from the earth, when it receives the invocation of God, is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two realities, earthly and heavenly; so also our bodies, when they receive the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, having the hope of resurrection to eternity.[2]

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.2.2, p. 528. Cf. I Cor. 10:16 and Col. 1:14. Also see Harvey, op.cit., Vol. II, pp. 318-319.

[2] Against Heresies, IV.18.5, p. 486. The Greek text for "no longer the common bread" in Harvey's edition: "οὐκέτι κοινὸς ἄρτος ἐστιν." (Harvey, op.cit., Vol. II, p. 206). Cf. Justin Martyr, I Apology, 66, p. 185.

Harvey rightly makes a remark that "nothing can be more express and clear than the language of the fathers upon this point," and he presents different opinions that prevail in the Ancient Church. Ignatius speaks of the eucharist as the flesh of Christ; Justin Martyr follows the same line; Ambrose also says that the sacred elements consecrated by the Word of Christ are His body and blood; John Chrysostom also says that the elements are changed in character by the words of Christ.[1]

Irenaeus also teaches the realism of the eucharist with other fathers. At this point, the important question we have to ask is whether Irenaeus teaches the change of the substance of the bread and wine. Obviously Irenaeus teaches that there is a change in the bread and wine after the invocation of God, because he explicitly states that they are no longer common bread and wine. However, he does not indicate any change in substance.[2] Then how are we to understand Irenaeus' teaching about the real body and blood? There are several ways to approach this problem. We noticed that Irenaeus combines soteriological and cosmological aspects in his theology of the eucharist and he specifically mentions the bread and cup to be a part of the creation and says that "we are also nourished by means of the creation."[1] We are also reminded that Irenaeus speaks of the creation in Logos and through Logos.

---

[1] See Harvey, op.cit., Vol. II. p. 206 footnote.

[2] See ibid., p. 318 footnote. Cf. Gregory Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy (London: Dacre Press Adam & Charles Black, 1954), p. 244. He points out that "the metaphysical questions about the correlation of bread and wine with Body and Blood which have so troubled the mind of the Christian West since the ninth century did not exist for these writers [second century writers]."

It is the incarnate and risen Lord who imparts His life to His followers by baptism, and nourishment to them by the eucharist. Thus it is the Word of God who makes the bread no longer the "common bread" but the "Eucharist, consisting of two realities, earthly and heavenly."[2] In this way, Irenaeus can talk about the bread and wine as being the real body and blood of Christ, even though they are not changed materially. He can even argue that the faithful believer receives the hope of the resurrection of his flesh by being nourished by the blood and body of Christ in the eucharist.

---

[1] Supra, p. 233.

[2] Supra, p. 234.

Just as in the Incarnation the Word turned into flesh and the incarnate Lord became both earthly and heavenly, so in the eucharist the bread and wine consist of two realities, being turned into the body and blood of Christ. As to the problem of how this is possible, we have already mentioned one explanation, i.e., the fact that the Word was the Creator of the world.[1] Beyond that Irenaeus regards it to be "mystery." The whole mystery is done through "receiving the Word of God."[2]

Another aspect of Irenaeus' eucharistic theology is his view of the eucharist as an oblation, a sacrifice, which ultimately renews the whole of the mystery of the atonement on the Cross. The sacrificial character of the eucharist is evident to Irenaeus, but our present concern is to note the particular sense in which Irenaeus emphasizes its sacrificial character. He regards the eucharist as a sacrifice of "first fruit" and he sees in the eucharist the new oblation of the new covenant that had been announced by Malachi.[1] In this connection Irenaeus introduces the notion of "thanksgiving" in the eucharist as the word, εύχαριστία, implies. In the true sacrifice, the spirit of "thanksgiving" should be always present. As Dix indicates, the offering of the first fruits is "acknowledging the Creator's bounty in providing our earthly food."[2]

---

[1] Hitchcok also observes this notion when he writes, "Such a sacramental union of the Word with the consecrated elements would be based by him on the fact that the Word was the Creator of the world." (op.cit., p. 278).

[2] Against Heresies, V.2.3, p. 528.

The concept of sacrifice as an expression of thanksgiving also means that the real sacrifice is the sacrifice of the heart. Thus Irenaeus writes,

> Sacrifices, therefore, do not sanctify a man, for God stands in no need of sacrifice; but it is the conscience of the offerer that

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.17.5, p. 484. This view of eucharist as the new sacrifice was prominent among the writers of the Ancient Church. Kelly writes, " . . . the eucharist was regarded as the distinctively Christian sacrifice from the closing decade of the first century, if not earlier. Malachi's prediction (1, 10f) that the Lord would reject the Jewish sacrifices and instead would have a pure offering made to Him by the Gentiles in every place was early seized upon by Christians as a prophecy of the eucharist." Then he gives examples in Didache, Clement, Ignatius and of course Irenaeus. (Early Christian Doctrines, p. 196).

[2] Dix, op.cit., p. 114.

> sancitfies the sacrifice when it is pure,
> and thus moves God to accept [the offering]
> as from a friend.[1]

And it is the Church alone who offers "this pure oblation to the Creator, offering to Him, with giving of thanks the things taken from His creation."[2]

Offering sacrifice is not for the benefit of the One who receives the sacrifice, or for His own need, but it is for the offerer. The act of sacrifice is man's duty because it is natural to be grateful to the Creator in whose image he was created. Thus by offering the acceptable gift of God, he himself is glorified.

> The oblation of the Church, therefore, which the Lord gave instructions to be offered throughout all the world, is accounted with God a pure sacrifice, and is acceptable to Him, not that He stands in need of a sacrifice from us, but that he who offers himself is glorified in what he does offer, if his gift be accepted.[3]

At this point we have to relate this concept of the eucharist as a sacrifice of the "first fruits" with the atoning death of Christ as a sacrifice. Irenaeus lays emphasis on the eucharistic offering as the first fruits of the creation especially because of his concern to combat the Gnostic conception of the material creation as being evil. However, this idea of the first fruits does not exclude the idea of Christ's atoning death as sacrifice.

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.18.3, p. 485. [ ] in the original.

[2] Ibid., IV.18.4, p. 485.

[3] Ibid., IV.18.1, p. 484.

We find a passage where Irenaeus clearly expresses that the death of Christ was itself a sacrifice.

> For Abraham, according to his faith, followed the command of the Word of God, and with a ready mind delivered up, as a sacrifice to God, his only begotten and beloved son, in order that God also might be pleased to offer up for all his seed His own beloved and only-begotten Son, as a sacrifice for our redemption.[1]

In the light of Irenaeus' realism, then, we can say that Irenaeus undoubtedly grasped the passion not only as an event of the past but of the present offering of the eucharist. However, we have to be extremely careful not to mis-interpret Irenaeus lest we should think that Christ is corporally offered in the eucharist. He does not teach the sacrifice of Christ in the late medieval fashion as a fresh sacrifice; it is the ἀνάμνησις of that once for all event at Calvary.

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.5.4, p. 467.

To sum up, we may say that in his theology of the eucharist, Irenaeus demonstrates a strong eschatological emphasis which is consistent with his anthropology. Man created in the image of God is destined to grow to be fully man. It is only by God alone that man can become man, because only Christ can restore fallen mankind and fulfill his final destiny in the consummation. The Church through her sacraments and ministry leads men toward the end when all will be in Christ in whose image man was created.

In his eucharistic theology Irenaeus shows a remarkable ability to relate Christology and anthropology, weaving them into one whole of soteriology which is inseparably related to the doctrine of creation. His eucharistic theology is also inclusive and well-balanced in terms of both the physical and spiritual nature of man. Some scholars indicated that Irenaeus' eucharistic theology is physical in contrast to spiritual,[1] but that which Irenaeus emphasizes in his doctrine of the eucharist is man as a unity.

---

[1] Maurice Wiles points out that the physical nature of the sacraments was a matter of especial importance to the early writers like Irenaeus. (The Christian Fathers [London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1966]), p. 111.

Irenaeus is also inclusive in his exposition of the eucharist in relation to Christ. By including the Incarnation, the Cross and the Resurrection of the Lord in his theology of the eucharist, he is actually demonstrating that both the person and the work of Christ are important in soteriology. Neither the Protestant tendency to over-stress the atonement nor the Roman Catholic tendency to over-stress the Incarnation is characteristic of Irenaeus; in him we find a well-balanced soteriology. Moreover, Irenaeus relates the basic anthropological concept, i.e., the death of the old man and the resurrection of the new man, to the eucharist that includes the Death and the Resurrection of the incarnate Lord.

2. Christ and the Spirit

We have concentrated our discussion on Christ as the incarnate, crucified, and risen Lord who led men from death to life. Christ has obtained life for men in His "becoming flesh," in His love to be crucified, and in His victory over death. Yet that life will not be obtained by men in the full sense until they grow into the fulness of God's image and likeness in which they were created.

In other words, justification alone does not constitute a complete soteriology; a saved man is he who is born again in Christ and sanctified by the Holy Spirit. Now we shall proceed to our discussion on Christ and the Holy Spirit.

We have seen that when Irenaeus considers God in His intrinsic being, he shows that God is ineffably one. Simultaneously, however, we have a very explicit Trinitarian vision of the Godhead in the thought of Irenaeus. Irenaeus is a theologian who developed the whole economy of salvation by the Truine God. Thus any anthropological discussion is inseparably related to the doctrine of the Trinity and only by seeing the manifestation of the economy of salvation in its entirety, do we have a complete anthropology.

In the thought of Irenaeus man cannot be a man without the Spirit of God; in many passages he describes how it is only the man who receives the Spirit that is truly man. At the same time, we are also well aware that the perfect image of man is found only in Jesus Christ, that is, man is created in Christ. Moreover, the Incarnation is the unique event in the entire history of salvation and the climax of God's saving work is found in the person and work of Jesus Christ.

Then how are we to understand the relationship between the Spirit and Christ in the thought of Irenaeus? It is not very difficult to find the double relation between the Spirit and Christ in Irenaeus' presentation. First, Jesus is presented as the bearer of the Spirit. In this case, the Spirit is described as having divine priority over Jesus. The role of the Spirit before the Incarnation is described in this manner:

> And the third article is the Holy Spirit through whom the prophets prophesied and the patriarchs were taught about God and the just were led in the path of justice, and who in the end of times has been poured forth in a new manner upon humanity over all the earth renewing man to God.[1]

He also expresses that without the Spirit it is not possible to know the Son, saying,

---

[1] Proof of the Apostolic Preaching, 6, p. 51. Cf. Justin Martyr, I Apology, 6, p. 164. Many scholars maintain that in order to do justice to the teaching of Irenaeus as to the Holy Spirit, we should pay some attention to the view of Justin Martyr, because Irenaeus must have been familiar with the writings of Justin Martyr. (See J. A. Robinson, op.cit. He has a long section on "The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Justin and Irenaeus"). We can conjecture that Irenaeus was somewhat influenced by Justin in his teaching of the Holy Spirit, but Irenaeus holds the wider and more advanced conception of the Spirit's work than Justin. For instance, Irenaeus also mentions the work of the Holy Spirit in the ancient prophets, even though he does not use the exact term, "the prophetic Spirit," which is Justin's favorite term. At the same time, however, Irenaeus goes beyond Justin's expressions and widens the function of the Holy Spirit.

> So without the Spirit there is no seeing the Word of God, and without the Son there is no approaching the Father; for the Son is knowledge of the Father, and knowledge of the Son is through the Holy Spirit.[1]

Irenaeus also speaks of the birth of Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit.[2] He points out that the Spirit is active in preparing Christ for His ministry by baptism. The same Spirit that was predicted in the Old Testament descended upon the Son of God so that He would do the will of the Father.[3]

In the same place where Irenaeus describes the Spirit as having divine priority over Jesus, he also points out that Jesus is the sender of the Spirit. Thus he speaks of the Spirit who descended at the Pentecost and the Comforter whom the Lord promised to send.

> This Spirit did David ask for the human race, saying, "And stablish me with Thine

---

[1] Proof of the Apostolic Preaching, 7, pp. 51-52.

[2] Ibid., 40, p. 73. Cf. Mat. 1:20, Lk. 1:35. The idea of the Spirit as having divine priority over Jesus is dominant in the Synoptic Gospels and often it is interpreted as the fulfillment of the Old Testament prophecy. Here it is the Spirit who qualifies Jesus to be Messiah whom the prophets prophesied.

[3] Against Heresies, III.17.1, p. 444.

> all-governing Spirit;" who also as Luke says, descended at the day of Pentecost upon the disciples after the Lord's ascension, having power to admit all nations to the entrance of life, and to the opening of the new covenant; from whence also, with one accord in all languages, they uttered praise to God, the Spirit bringing distant tribes to unity, and offering to the Father the first-fruits of all nations. Wherefore also the Lord promised to send the Comforter, who should join us to God.[1]

In the same passage of the Proof of the Apostolic Preaching, where Irenaeus describes the Spirit through whom the knowledge of the Son is obtained, he also writes,

> But the Son, according to the Father's good-pleasure, administers the Spirit charismatically as the Father will, to those to whom He will.[2]

There is no doubt, then, that Irenaeus is aware of the two aspects in regard to the relation between the Holy Spirit and Christ. At the same time, the very way he presents the Holy Spirit and Christ testifies that these two seemingly difficult relations are complementary, not contradictory. In fact, often Irenaeus describes the economy of the Son and the Spirit in such a way that their relation is obviously complementary.

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.17.2, p. 444. Cf. Jn. 16:7. Many clear passages can be found in the Gospel of John which support the view that Jesus is the sender of the Spirit. Christ talks about the Holy Spirit who will be sent in His name and who will witness for Him in Jn. 14:26. Again a clear idea that Jesus gave the Holy Spirit is expressed in Jn. 20:22. Moreover, there are also many passages which seem to reflect that Jesus has to withdraw in order for the Holy Spirit to come and stay forever. (Jn. 16:17).

[2] Proof of the Apostolic Preaching, 7, p. 52.

> For man does not see God by his own powers; but when He pleases He is seen by men, by whom He wills, and when He wills, and as He wills. For at that time indeed, prophetically through the Spirit, and seen, too, adoptively through the Son; and He shall also be seen paternally in the kingdom of heaven, the Spirit truly preparing man in the Son of God, and the Son leading him to the Father, while the Father, too, confers [upon him] the incorruption for eternal life, which comes to every one from the fact of his seeing God.[1]

It is when we specifically deal with the Church as the body of Christ and Christ as the head of the body that the Holy Spirit comes in especially as the Spirit of Christ. If Christ is the head of the Church which is His body, the Holy Spirit is He who gives the life from the body of Christ. Thus writes Irenaeus,

> For where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God; and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church, and every kind of grace; but the Spirit is truth. Those, therefore, who do not partake of Him, are neither nourished into life from the mother's breasts,

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.20.5, p. 489. [ ] in the original.

> nor do they enjoy that most limpid fountain which issues from the body of Christ; but they dig for themselves broken cisterns out of earthly trenches, and drink putrid water out of the mire, fleeing from the faith of the Church lest they be convicted; and rejecting the Spirit, that they may not be instructed.[1]

In this kind of passage it is obvious that the Holy Spirit is He who continues the work of Christ in the Church. Thus, if the Holy Spirit who came upon sinful men started His divinely continous work of Christ at Pentecost in the Church, it can be asserted that the Spirit is the Spirit of Christ.[2]

It is not so much in the sense of inter-Trinitarian relationship but in the economy of the Son and the Spirit that the Spirit is the Spirit of Christ. Irenaeus demonstrates this point well when he writes,

> The Father is indeed above all, and He is the Head of the Christ; but the Word is through all things, and is Himself the Head of the Church; while the Spirit is in us all, and He is the living water, which the Lord grants to those who rightly believe in Him, and love Him, and who know that "there is one Father, who is above all, and through all, and in us all."[3]

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.24.1, p. 458.

[2] Supra, p. 247.

[3] Against Heresies, V.18.2, p. 546.

In the words of Lossky, this aspect is interpreted as following:

> It is in the body of Christ, according to St. Irenaeus, that we have access to the fount of the Holy Spirit. It is therefore necessary to be united to the body of Christ in order to receive the grace of the Holy Spirit. Yet the one and the other--the union with Christ and the giving of grace--are wrought through the same Spirit.[1]

It is evident that the presence of the Spirit is always secondary to, and consequent upon, the presence of incarnate Christ. However, for Irenaeus the Spirit is not merely another name of the exalted Christ, for the economy of the Holy Spirit has a very distinctive place in Irenaeus' soteriology. In fact, Irenaeus manages to maintain Christocentric theology by safeguarding both Christology and Pneumatology together.

The importance of the Spirit in relation to the person and work of Christ can be more clearly seen when we approach the issue from an anthropological point of view. The growth of man which was hindered by the Fall was made possible by Christ who annulled the harm wrought by the Fall. Thus if man was enabled to grow again by the Son who was made man, it is the Spirit who makes His dwelling-place in man and leads man toward perfection, i.e., toward his image in Christ.

---

[1] Lossky, op.cit., p. 177.

> These things, therefore, He recapitulated in Himself: by uniting man to the Spirit, and causing the Spirit to dwell in man, He is Himself made the head of the Spirit, and gives the Spirit to be the head of man: for through Him (the Spirit) we see, and hear, and speak.[1]

The economy of the Spirit as the sanctification and perfection of man is to give back to man the resemblance to God and to the Son so that he can be a man as he was created and destined to become. Since man cannot do anything to make himself man without the Spirit, it is only when he is led by the Spirit and united to the Spirit that he is able to become truly a man. "There is freedom for man," writes Wingren, "from the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost, i.e. the possibility of being man."[2]

Irenaeus' doctrine of the Spirit as active in sanctification of the believer united with Christ is consistent with his teleological anthropology. One can say that without the Spirit who leads man through His creative process toward perfection, man cannot reach the final destination where he is supposed to reach in order to be fully man. That is, for Irenaeus the perfect man is a saved man by the operation of the Triune God.

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.20.2, p. 548.

[2] Wingren, op.cit., p. 164.

> Thus, therefore, was God revealed; for God the Father is shown forth through all these [operations], the Spirit indeed working, and the Son ministering, while the Father was approving, and man's salvation being accomplished.[1]

Thus for Irenaeus a man cannot possess his identity as man in separation from the economy of the Son and the Spirit, because it is in the Son that the Spirit is given by God to man and man is thereby united with God. However, when we deal with the Spirit who leads men toward perfection, we should not dismiss the notion of man's own response. When Irenaeus speaks of the Holy Spirit working in man and for man toward the fulfillment of God's entire plan of salvation, he does not neglect speaking of man's response to the Spirit. In fact, his doctrine of man which gives an important place to the freedom of man himself is in accordance with his doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Through training by the Spirit, man is given a gradual and natural discipline for reception into that glory which shall be revealed in those who love God.[1]

---

[1] *Against Heresies*, IV.20.6, p. 489. [ ] in the original.

Closely related to the idea of man's response to the educational work of the Holy Spirit is Irenaeus' view of life as moral, spiritual and educational. He is far from holding the view that life is mere probation. In fact, this view that life is not mere probation is the backbone of Irenaeus' anthropology, for it is consistent with his teleological understanding of man who is endowed with freedom. John Hick rightly remarks,

> And instead of the Augustinian view of life's trials as a divine punishment for Adam's sin, Irenaeus sees our world of mingled good and evil as a divinely appointed environment for man's development towards the perfection that represents the fulfillment of God's good purpose for him.[2]

For Irenaeus the experience in good and evil, in strength and weakness has a teleological value. He put emphasis on "being instructed by every mode" so that we may be accurate in all things for the future, being ignorant neither of God nor of ourselves.[1] Therefore, in the final analysis, even evil and suffering have educational value which will be entirely for the benefit of man. This is also consistent with his basic view that "with God there is nothing without purpose or due signification."[2] This aspect is well expressed when Irenaeus argues that the power of God shines forth in the weakness of human flesh. He writes,

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.20.8, p. 490. Also see ibid., IV.28, pp. 501-502.

[2] Hick, op.cit., p. 220.

> For strength is made perfect in weakness, rendering him a better man who by means of his infirmity becomes acquainted with the power of God. For how could a man have learned that he is himself an infirm being, and mortal by nature, but that God is immortal and powerful, unless he had learned by experience what is in both? For there is nothing evil in learning one's infirmities by endurance; yea, rather, it has even the beneficial effect of preventing him from forming an undue opinion of his own nature (non aberrare in natura sus).[3]

Irenaeus directly relates the true knowledge of God and man to man's love toward God and man's glory. "Now, where there exists an increase of love, there a greater glory is wrought out by the power of God for those who love Him."[1]

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.2.2, p. 528.

[2] Ibid., IV.21.3, p. 493.

[3] Ibid., V.3.1, p. 529.

The Spirit who is inseparably related to man in his creation, growth, and perfection brings man to incorruption. Christ bestows the Spirit on man as His work of salvation and in turn the Spirit unites man with Christ. But man's final unity with the Son is not achieved until the resurrection, because it is in the resurrection that the final victory of the Son is seen. For Irenaeus, the final result of the work of the Spirit is the salvation of the flesh. Thus he writes,

> Now the final result of the work of the Spirit is the salvation of the flesh. For what other visible fruit is there of the invisible Spirit, than the rendering of the flesh mature and capable of incorruption?[2]

Thus it is not until the consummation that the perfection of man that begins with the first effusion of the Holy Spirit and the final victory that was decided in the Christ event is achieved. We shall now turn our attention to the man at the end.

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.3.1, p. 529.

[2] Ibid., V.12.4, p. 538.

CHAPTER VII

MAN AT THE END

1. Reward and Judgment

Irenaeus' teaching in regard to reward and judgment is closely related to his anthropology. Just as he is able to maintain that man was responsible for his falling an easy prey to evil because he was endowed with free will, he is also able to argue that God can judge and reward men. Thus writes Irenaeus,

> . . . and that God has always preserved freedom, and the power of self-government in man, while at the same time He issued His own exhortations, in order that those who do not obey Him should be righteously judged (condemned) because they have not obeyed Him; and that those who have obeyed and believed on Him should be honored with immortality.[1]

When man wants to be a man estranged from his Maker, he is rightly judged, while a grateful man is the instrument of His glorification.

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.15.2, p. 480.

> For the receptacle of His goodness, and the instrument of His glorification, is the man who is grateful to Him that made him; and again, the receptacle of His just judgment is the ungrateful man, who both despises his Maker and is not subject to His Word; . . . [1]

Closely related to his teaching in regard to God's judgment and reward is God's justice and goodness. In the third book, chapter 25 of Against Heresies, Irenaeus presents a strong argument for one God who is both endowed with infinite justice to punish the wicked and infinite goodness to bless the pious. It is inconceivable for Irenaeus to separate the justice and goodness of God; for him the perfect God is He who is both good and just. Thus attacking Marcion for dividing God into two parts, maintaining one to be good and the other judicial, Irenaeus writes,

> For he that is the judicial one, if he be not good, is not God, because he from whom goodness is absent is not God at all; and again, he who is good, if he has no judicial power, suffers the same [loss] as the former, by being deprived of his character of deity. And how can they call the Father of all wise, if they do not assign to Him a judicial faculty? For if

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.11.2, p. 474.

> He is wise, He is also one who tests [others]; but the judicial power belongs to him who tests, and the justice follows the judicial faculty, that it may reach a just conclusion; justice calls forth judgment, and judgment, when it is executed with justice, will pass on to wisdom.[1]

As it is already expressed in the above passage, the very fact that in God the justice and goodness are well-balanced directly points to His wisdom. The following passage confirms this fact:

> Therefore the Father will excel in wisdom all human and angelic wisdom, because He is Lord, and Judge, and the Just One, and Ruler over all. For He is good, and merciful, and patient, and saves whom He ought: nor does goodness desert Him in the exercise of justice, nor is His wisdom lessened; for He saves those whom He should save, and judges those worthy of judgment.[2]

The real sign that God's judgment is consistent with His justice is found in the goodness of God that "goes on before, and takes precedency" of His justice that does not "show Himself unmercifully just."[3] Irenaeus elaborates on this in the following manner:

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.25.3, p. 459. [ ] in the original.

[2] Ibid., III.25.3, p. 459.

[3] Ibid., III.25.3, p. 459.

> The God, therefore, who does benevolently cause His sun to rise upon all, and sends rain upon the just and unjust, shall judge those who, enjoying His equally distributed kindness, have led lives not corresponding to the dignity of His bounty; but who have spent their days in wantonness and luxury, in opposition to His benevolence, and have, moreover, even blasphemed Him who has conferred so great benefits upon them.[1]

The other way to maintain that God's judgment is consistent with His justice and goodness is to say that it is man's own fault if he estranges himself from God and so is deprived of the glory which God bestows on him out of His abundant love. This idea is expressed in the following manner:

> Submission to God is eternal rest, so that they who shun the light have a place worthy of their flight; and those who fly from eternal rest, have a habitation in accordance with their fleeing. Now, since all good things are with God, they who by their own determination fly from God, do defraud themselves of all good things; and having been [thus] defrauded of all good things with respect to God, they shall consequently fall under the just judgment of God.[2]

Irenaeus strongly insists that if men fall under the judgment of God and dwell in darkness, "they do themselves become the cause to themselves that they are destitute of light."[1] Because God bestows light upon everybody, it is man's own determination that separates him from God.

---

[1] _Against Heresies_, III.25.4, p. 459.

[2] _Ibid._, IV.39.4, p. 523. [ ] in the original.

The cause of the imperfection and separation from God dwells in men, because in spite of the fact that God called men to a perfect communion with Him, it was men who did not obey Him.[2] God's love was abundant enough not only to make men "sons of God" according to creation,[3] but also to set them free from the bondage of the Evil One. This is all the more reason why men themselves are responsible when they are either punished or rewarded. If we should depart from God, it is betraying God's very intention of setting us free, and if we dwell in Him we shall receive more glory from Him.

> For He did not set us free for this purpose, that we should depart from Him (no one, indeed, while placed out of reach of the Lord's benefits, has power to procure for himself the means of salvation), but that the more we receive His grace, the more we should love Him. Now the more we have loved Him, the more

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.39.4, p. 523.

[2] Ibid., IV.39.3, p. 523.

[3] Ibid., IV.41.2, p. 524.

> glory shall we receive from Him, when we are continually in the presence of the Father.[1]

Since Irenaeus' teaching about reward and judgment is so closely linked with his doctrine of man who is endowed with freedom and is capable of responding to God's grace, Irenaeus is naturally familiar with the idea of judgment and reward as continuous and present. God's reward and His nearness are present realities:

> Through the invocation of the name of Jesus Christ, crucified under Pontius Pilate, Satan is cast out from men, and wherever anyone shall call upon Him, invoking Him, of those who believe in Him and do His will, He comes and stands close by, accomplishing the petitions of those who invoke Him with a pure heart. Having thereby received salvation, we are constant in rendering thanks to God, our Saviour through His great inscrutable and unsearchable wisdom, and the Preacher of redemption from heaven-- . . .[2]

Thus, judgment is not something that happens only at the end. When man resists the Creator and chooses to live by himself, it is God's judgment that he experiences even in the present life. Man lives continuously under the obligation of the law of creation, and when he fails to respond to it, he finds himself under God's judgment.

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.13.3, p. 478.

[2] Proof of the Apostolic Preaching, 97, p. 107.

Irenaeus points out God's present judgment in the case of the Egyptians who received temporal punishments from God.[1] He also indicates that the punishment under the new law is more serious, saying,

> For as, in the New Testament, that faith of men [to be placed] in God has been increased, receiving in addition [to what was already revealed] the Son of God, that man too might be a partaker of God; so is also our walk in life required to be more circumspect, when we are directed not merely to abstain from evil actions, but even from evil thoughts, and from idle words, and empty talk, and scurrilous language: thus also the punishment of those who do not believe the Word of God, and despise His advent, and are turned away backwards, is increased; being not merely temporal, but rendered also eternal.[2]

Against Gnostic asceticism that is based on the teaching that some are by nature good and others bad, Irenaeus indicates that all men are of the same nature, in which he sees another reason why it is fair that some are judged and some are praised. Again in his own words,

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.28.3, p. 501.

[2] Ibid., IV.28.2, p. 501. [ ] in the original.

> But if some had been made by nature bad, and others good, these latter would not be deserving of praise for being good, for such were they created; nor would the former be reprehensible, for thus they were made [originally]. But since all men are of the same nature, able both to hold fast and to do what is good; and on the other hand, having also the power to cast it from them and not to do it,--some do justly receive praise even among men who are under the control of good laws (and much more from God), and obtain deserved testimony of their choice of good in general, and of preserving therein; but the others are blamed, and receive a just condemnation, because of their rejection of what is fair and good.[1]

In this passage, we notice a vigorous spiritual power that is inseparably linked with man's power of choice and ability to practice what is good. At the same time, Irenaeus expresses that reward and judgment are not only something vertical, that is, something that happens between God and men, but they are also horizontal, being present reality among men themselves. At this point, however, Irenaeus is cautious enough to warn about the right idea of judgment among men themselves. He expounds the meaning of the Lord's saying in Matt. 7:1-2.

> And therefore has the Lord said: "Judge not, that ye be not judged: for with what

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.37.2, p. 519. [ ] in the original.

> judgment ye shall judge, ye shall be judged." [The meaning is] not certainly that we should not find fault with sinners, nor that we should consent to those who act wickedly; but that we should not pronounce an unfair judgment on the dispensations of God, inasmuch as He has Himself made provision that all things shall turn out for good, in a way consistent with justice.[1]

The teaching of Irenaeus in regard to reward and judgment is in a sense very much existential, to use the modern jargon, because man's present life and the consequence of his own conduct and attitude toward life is something that he has to face in the present reality. The voice of God's judgment is addressed to the man who listens in the present.

The idea of judgment as something continuous and present does not preclude the notion of the Great Judgment at the second coming of the Lord. For Irenaeus the idea of the second coming of the Lord is a very vigorous one; the Lord will come in the same flesh in which he suffered, revealing the glory of the Father.[2] In fact, his treatment of the second coming of the Lord is so real that Lawson makes the following remark:

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.30.3, p. 504. [ ] in the original.

[2] Ibid., III.16.8, p. 443.

> The subject of the Christian Hope is treated fully and emphatically, with a wealth of quotation from the apocalyptical portions of the Old and the New Testaments. No part of his theology is more plainly of directly Biblical and Hebraic inspiration than this.[1]

Closely related to the subject of the Lord's second coming is Irenaeus' teaching of the Kingdom of the Son. As we deal with this subject of the Lord's earthly Kingdom, we have some textual problems. That is, the chapters from 32-6 of his last book of Against Heresies, in which he describes his views on the last days, are questionable in terms of their authenticity. Most of the scholars notice that this part does not appear in all the manuscripts. Furthermore, there are parts where the text is imperfect. Perhaps we may conjecture that the reason for this textual problem has to do with the chiliastic views that are dealt with in this section. In other words, the reason why this section is omitted in some of the manuscripts is that the teaching of chiliasm was regarded as heresy, especially during the medieval period.[1] Thus the authenticity of the text can be maintained and we have to deal with Irenaeus' physical language concerning eschatology.

---

[1] Lawson, op.cit., p. 279.

Scholars seem to hold slightly different views on Irenaeus' material views of a millennium and we can discern an apologetic tone in their interpretation; they presuppose that millenarianism was not orthodox teaching. Scholars like Cayré, Maurice Wiles, Kelly, all indicate that it was the Gnostic tendency to dissolve Christian eschatology into the myth of soul's ascending to the place of its origin that made Irenaeus affirm the millenarian hope of a thousand year reign by Christ on a renewed and rejuvenated earth.[2] Laeuchli indicates that

---

[1] Hitchcock writes, "The five chapters 32-37 of this book were not found in the manuscripts used by Erasmus, but were unearthed by Feuardent, who asserted that they were from the hand of Irenaeus and that they had been omitted on account of their pronounced chiliastic views." (op.cit., p. 307). Cf. Wingren, op.cit., pp. 180-189. He writes, ". . . . but such gaps are almost self-explanatory, since belief in the so-called 'thousand years' reign' on earth was rejected at an early period, and in the medieval tradition was regarded as a heresy."

[2] F. Cayré, Manual of Patrology, trans. by H. Howitt (Desclee & Co., Paris, 1927), p. 153. Maurice Wiles, op.cit., p. 92. Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, p. 465.

Irenaeus' nonspeculative use of ἐκκλησία also has to do with his teaching about the earthly Kingdom of God.[1]

Regardless of how scholars approach the teaching of Irenaeus' millenarianism, they do not deny the fact that Irenaeus accepted it. Gustaf Wingren, however, seems to be hesitant in using the term, millenarianism itself, writing, "But terms like 'chiliasm' and 'millenarianism' are hardly appropriate expressions for the eschatology of Irenaeus."[2] Wingren argues that "there is not a single mention of the words 'thousand years' throughout Irenaeus' description of the Kingdom of the Son,"[3] and he concludes as follows:

> We shall best understand the connexion which Irenaeus makes between Rev. xx and 1 Cor. xv. 24-8 if we employ the term 'the Kingdom of the Son,' a kingdom on earth before Christ 'delivers up' the Kingdom to the Father.[4]

If the Kingdom which will be established at the second coming of the Lord is that which Wingren simply designates as the "Kingdom of the Son" in an eschatological sense, his somewhat different argument in regard to the problem of millenarianism in Irenaeus would not be a problem, because they virtually mean the same thing. On the other hand, however, he points out that the term, *regnum*, is sometimes used as

---

[1] Laeuchli, op.cit., p. 199.

[2] Wingren, op. cit., p. 190.

[3] *Ibid*., p. 190.

[4] *Ibid*., pp. 190-191.

> being contemporaneous with the dominion of Christ in all its phases from the beginning of His work of recapitulation in His becoming man, through the Cross and resurrection, the Church and the final Kingdom on earth, to His delivering up of the Kingdom.[1]

Thus he sets out another view on *regnum* as "a becoming visible on earth of Christ's dominion" before the world disappears.[2]

With all these interpretations in mind, we can still admit that Irenaeus teaches the earthly Kingdom of the Lord in a very literal sense. Before the second coming of the Lord, there is the recapitulation of the Evil One which Irenaeus describes in a very literal manner:

> And there is therefore in this beast, when he comes, a recapitulation made of all sorts of iniquity and of every deceit, in order that all apostate power, flowing into and being shut up in him, may be sent into

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 191.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 192.

> the furnace of fire. Fittingly, therefore, shall his name possess the number six hundred and sixty six, since he sums up in his own person all the commixture of wickedness which took place previous to the deluge, due to the apostasy of the angels. For Noah was six hundred years old when the deluge came upon the earth, sweeping away the rebellious world, for the sake of that most infamous generation which lived in the times of Noah. And [AntiChrist] also sums up every error of devised idols since the flood, together with the slaying of the prophets and cutting of the just.[1]

Then for Irenaeus the increasing power of the evil is not a sign of despair, for as the evil power increases, the time that evil power will be vanquished is approaching. Thus after a recapitulation of all sorts of evil power, Christ will come and sweep them away in His glory and victory.

It is interesting to notice that Irenaeus speaks of the recapitulation of the Devil in such a realistic way that when he describes the victory of the One who comes, it is quite picturesque and magnificent. This is to say that for Irenaeus the dualism between the demonic power and the power of Christ is very much real from the beginning to the very end, but the final victory is that of Christ.

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.29.2, p. 558. [ ] in the original. Also see V.25.1, p. 553. Here Irenaeus describes the tyrannical Kingdom of AntiChrist as it is described in Daniel and Paul.

Thus the very first step of the beginning of His earthly Kingdom is to destroy the power of the evil which was recapitulated by Satan. Then Irenaeus speaks of the resurrection of the righteous ones who have been waiting in paradise prepared for them.[1] It seems to be clear that he speaks of the reign of Christ with His risen saints in His earthly Kingdom. However, we confront somewhat of a confusing notion when Irenaeus describes two kinds of resurrection. In other words, he mentions the resurrection of the righteous ones who reign with Christ in His Kingdom and the resurrection of those who are worthy of punishment.

> And therefore, when the number fixed upon is completed, that number which He had predetermined in His own counsel, all those who have been enrolled for life eternal shall rise again, having their own bodies, and having also their own souls, and their

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.5.1, p. 531.

> own spirits, in which they had pleased God. Those, on the other hand, who are worthy of punishment, shall go away into it, they too having their own souls, and their own bodies, in which they stood apart from the grace of God.[1]

Gustaf Wingren attempts to understand two different resurrections by holding the view that Irenaeus relates two New Testament passages, Rev. 20:1-21:4 which speaks of the first resurrection of the just and 1 Cor. 15:24-28 which speaks of the Kingdom of the Son and delivering up the Kingdom to the Father.[2] Thus he writes that "Irenaeus describes the state between the first resurrection and the second as 'the Kingdom of the Son'."[3]

On the other hand, however, Lawson holds a different view from that of Wingren, which is clearly expressed when he compares Irenaeus with Justin:

> It is to be noticed that in this scheme the good and evil rise together, and the Judgment takes place before the Millennial Reign of

---

[1] Against Heresies, II.33.5, p. 411. Also see I.22.1, p. 347. Here Irenaeus also talks about the resurrection of the heretics, saying, "Yet, reluctant as they may be, these men shall one day rise again in the flesh, to confess the power of Him who raises them from the dead; but they shall not be numbered among the righteous on account of their unbelief."

[2] Wingren, op.cit., p. 182.

[3] Ibid., p. 182.

> the Saints upon earth. S. Irenaeus thus had a simpler arrangement than Justin, who on the basis of Revelation 20:5 taught that the Saints rose first, and that the resurrection of unbelievers to judgment took place at the end of thousand years.[1]

Irenaeus' teaching of the earthly Kingdom of Christ is undoubtedly an exegesis of Rev. 20:2-5 and he specifically mentions the reign of the righteous ones with the Lord in His Kingdom.[2] Furthermore, Irenaeus describes the Kingdom in which the saints are accustomed gradually to partake of the divine nature and he points out that the last judgment should take place afterwards. In Irenaeus' own words,

> Inasmuch, therefore, as the opinions of certain [orthodox persons] are derived from heretical discourses, they are both ignorant of God's dispensations, and of the mystery of the resurrection of the just, and of the [earthly] kingdom which is the commencement of incorruption, by means of which kingdom those who shall be worthy are accustomed gradually to partake of the divine nature (capere Deum); and it is necessary to tell them respecting those things, that it behooves the righteous first to receive the promise of the inheritance which God promised to the fathers, and to reign in it, when they

---

[1] Lawson, op.cit., p. 282.

[2] Against Heresies, V.35.1, p. 565.

> rise again to behold God in this creation which is renovated, and that the judgment should take place afterwards.[1]

In the light of this passage, then, Lawson is incorrect in his interpretation that both resurrection and judgment take place before the reign of the Kingdom, and Wingren's understanding of two resurrections is correct.

Irenaeus had a very vivid picture of the judgment that will take place at the end of the earthly Kingdom of the Lord. In this last judgment he again emphasizes that the punishment has been self-chosen, writing,

> Has the Word come for the ruin and for the resurrection of many? For the ruin, certainly, of those who do not believe Him, to whom also He has threatened a greater damnation in the judgment-day than that of Sodom and Gomorrah; but for the resurrection of believers, and those who do the will of His Father in heaven. If then the advent of the Son comes indeed alike to all, but is for the purpose of judging, and separating the believing from the unbelieving, since, as those who believe do His will agreeably to their own choice, and as, [also] agreeably to their own choice, the disobedient do not consent to His doctrine; it is manifest that His Father has made all in a like condition, each person having a choice of his own, and a free understanding; and that He has regard

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.32.1, p. 561. "to partake of the divine nature" could be translated as "gradually to comprehend God." [ ] in the original.

> to all things, and exercises a providence over all, "making His sun to rise upon the evil and on the good, and sending rain upon the just and unjust."[1]

Thus, even though the eternal fire was not originally prepared for man but for the Evil One and his apostate angels,[2] if men follow him and become the sons of the Evil One, they deserve God's punishment.

Those who rightly fall under God's judgment will be separated from God. Being separated from God means to experience every kind of punishment.

> But separation from God is death, and separation from light is darkness; and separation from God consists in the loss of all the benefits which He has in store. Those, therefore, who cast away by apostasy these forementioned things, being in fact destitute of all good, do experience every kind of punishment.[3]

Thus the fate of those on whom God's judgment is inflicted is not annihilation but eternal separation from God. At this point, Irenaeus stresses that God does not punish them immediately of Himself, "but that punishment falls upon them because they are destitute of all that is good."[1]

---

[1] *Against Heresies*, V.27.1, p. 556. [ ] in the original.

[2] *Ibid*., III.23.3, p. 456.

[3] *Ibid*., V.27.2, p. 556.

Along with the idea of the punishment of the ungodly, Irenaeus describes the reward of the just ones. In contrast to that of the ungodly, their reward is life eternal. Thus writes Irenaeus,

> And to as many as continue in their love towards God, does He grant communion with Him. But communion with God is life and light, and the enjoyment of all the benefits which He has in store.[2]

In conclusion, for Irenaeus the idea of reward and judgment is a very realistic one, closely related to his doctrine of man who is endowed with freedom of will and his doctrine of God in whom a perfect harmony of goodness and justice is preserved. His teaching in regard to the earthly Kingdom of Christ is also very literal and real. In fact, the so-called chiliasm in Irenaeus confirms his belief in history in which Christ's saving work is carried on and the righteous are accustomed gradually to partake of the divine nature. Moreover, the reign of the just in the earthly Kingdom is consistent with God's goodness and justice. Irenaeus explains it in this manner:

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.27.2, p. 556.

[2] Ibid., V.27.2, p. 556.

> For it is just that in that very creation in which they toiled or were afflicted, being proved in every way by suffering, they should receive the reward of their suffering; and that in the creation in which they were slain because of their love to God, in that they should be revived again; and that in the creation in which they endured servitude, in that they should reign.[1]

One other aspect we can find of this teaching is that the life of Christians in the world is that of taking up the cross. The suffering of Christians, however, will be richly rewarded by God. In other words, Christians are to suffer for their Master but there will be God's abundant reward for that suffering within history in the earthly Kingdom of Christ.

Of course the final glory of the just will be manifested when the "Son takes them and presents them to the Father; and the Father confers incorruptibility."[2] For the further examination of men's glory when they are taken to the Father by the Son, we must turn our discussion to Irenaeus' concept of recapitulation and deification.

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.32.1, p. 561

[2] Proof of the Apostolic Preaching, 7, p. 51.

2. Recapitulation

One of the central teachings of Irenaeus, if not the central teaching, is his doctrine of recapitulation. The Greek word for recapitulation in verb form is ἀνα-κεφαλαιόω. The meaning of ἀνά is very inclusive, connoting a slightly different meaning depending upon the case--in the genetive case, on board; dative, on, upon and in; accusative case, usually implying motion upwards. κεφαλαιόω means to bring under heads, to sum up, or to state summarily. The word, ἀνα-κεφαλαιοω, means to sum up, gather up, or present as a whole. At times it also means to repeat summarily and so to condense into a summary.[1]

Even after analysizing the word itself, we probably do not have a single word with which to express the meaning of recapitulatio or ἀνακεφαλαίωσις. Lawson points out that the foundation of all the implications of the word would be "going over the ground again,"[1] and Wingren writes that the attitude of Irenaeus himself is such that several different senses are all implied in the word.[2] Adhémar d'Ales makes a remark in his article, La Doctrine de la Récapitulation en Saint Irénée,

---

[1] Rom. 13:9, ". . . ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται, . . ." Eph. 1:10, ". . . ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, . . ." The literal translation of this passage can be: "to bring together again for himself all things and beings."

> The word recapitulation existed in the Christian realm. Irenaeus did not have to create it but he made it the axis of his soteriology and in this he showed himself original.[3]

Then perhaps the best way to define how the word is used in the theology of Irenaeus is to analyze some of the key concepts implied in the word.

i. Conflict and Victory

Undoubtedly the doctrine of recapitulation in Irenaeus is the key concept of his soteriology. The manner in which Christ's saving work is done is described in St. Paul's epistle to Ephesians 1:10 where the word "recapitulate" appears.[1] This concept of recapitulation seems to have reached Justin, and obviously Irenaeus was influenced by Justin, because he quotes Justin, writing,

---

[1] Lawson, op.cit., p. 143.

[2] Wingren, op.cit., xv, footnote.

[3] Adhémar d'Ales, "La Doctrine de la Récapitulation en Saint Irénée," Recherches de Science Religieuse (Paris: Aux Bureau de la Revue 6-7 Années, 1916, pp. 185-211), p. 185. My translation from French.

> In his book against Marcion, Justin does well say: "I would not have believed the Lord Himself, if He had announced any other than He who is our framer, maker, and nourisher. But because the only-begotten Son came to us from the one God, who both made this world and formed us, and contains and administers all things, summing up His own handiwork in Himself, my faith towards Him is stedfast, and my love to the Father immovable, God bestowing both upon us."[2]

Based on this Pauline concept of soteriology, Irenaeus elaborates the doctrine of recapitulation and manages to formulate a strong Christocentric theology. One of the prominent ideas in Irenaeus' soteriology is that of "restoration" by Christ of whatever the primal man lost by his disobedience. We have already studied the Fall and noticed that in the scheme of Irenaeus' thought, the dualism between the Evil One and Christ Himself is very real. Then it is very natural for

---

[1] Supra, p. 276, footnote 1.

[2] Against Heresies, IV.6.2, p. 468.

Irenaeus to depict a very vivid picture of the conflict and victory of Christ as he describes Christ's role as the "restoration." In other words, in order to restore what was lost, Christ had to go through conflict to victory with the One who was the very cause of that loss.

In expounding the concept of restoration, Irenaeus exploits to the full the parallelism between Adam and Christ. Indeed, Irenaeus describes Christ as the "second Adam" (ὁ δεύτερος Ἀδάμ) in whom we are reconciled.[1] The underlying idea of this parallelism is that what Adam lost only Christ can restore, but because it is what Adam lost, that Christ restores, Christ has to go over the same ground as Adam.[2] It is in this sense that the implication of the word recapitulation would be "going over the ground again" as Lawson points out.[1]

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.16.3, p. 544. The preserved Greek reads as following: "ἐν δὲ τῷ δευτέρω Ἀδὰμ ἀποκατηλλάγημεν, ὑπήκοοι μέχρι θανάτου γενόμενοι." (Stieren, op.cit., p. 762).

[2] Proof of the Apostolic Preaching, 32. p. 68. "Whence, then, comes the substance of the first man? From God's Will and Wisdom, and from virgin earth. For God had not rained, says the Scripture, before man was made, and there was no man to till the earth. From this earth, then, while it was still virgin, God took dust and fashioned man, the beginning of humanity. So the Lord, summing up afresh this man, reproduced the scheme of his incarnation, being born of a virgin by the Will and Wisdom of God, that He too might copy the incarnation of Adam, and man might be made, as was written in the beginning, according to the image and likeness of God."

It was necessary for Christ to become like Adam, i.e., to become man, in order to restore what Adam lost. Daniélou writes, "So the redemption is the cause of the Incarnation, but the Incarnation is the condition of the redemption."[2] In order to make man fully man who was created in the image and likeness of God, it was necessary for Christ to become man. In this sense, the Incarnation is a very concrete expression of Christ's recapitulating work. Irenaeus stresses that recapitulation begins with the birth of Jesus, i.e., when the Lord is incarnated, although He has been working in the old covenant.[3] It is only as the incarnate One that Christ is active as recapitulator.

---

[1] Supra, p. 277.

[2] Daniélou, op.cit., p. 166.

[3] It is perhaps in this sense that a scholar like Neve makes a remark: "His [Irenaeus'] thinking was Christo-centric, not Logos-centric. In other words, his interest was centered in Christ the God-Man as the Mediator of our salvation, and not in the Logos as the Mediator between God and the world." (J. L. Neve, A History of Christian Thought, Vol. 1 [The Muhlenberg Press, Philadelphia: Pennsylvania, 1946], p. 80).

> For I have shown that the Son of God did not then begin to exist, being with the Father from the beginning; but when He became incarnate and was made man, He commenced afresh the long line of human beings, and furnished us, in a brief, comprehensive manner, with salvation; so that what we had lost in Adam--namely, to be according to the image and likeness of God--that we might recover in Christ Jesus.[1]

The incarnate Lord is He who has been made flesh and blood after the way of the original formation of man, finally saving in His own person that which had in the beginning perished in Adam.[2] Precisely because the thing which had perished possessed flesh and blood, Christ had Himself "flesh and blood, recapitulating in Himself not a certain other, but that original handiwork of the Father."[3]

To say that Christ had to go over the same ground as the first man, Adam, implies that He also had to confront the power of the Evil One, and that the conflict He waged as a man was a necessary part of His Incarnation. This is to say that the restoration of Christ is not fulfilled unless He overcomes the conflict and obtains victory through the conflict. This can be also expressed that "He became man in order to undergo temptation."[1] Christ's victory, of course, consistent with Irenaeus' concept of God's sovereignty and his way of relating the doctrine of creation with soteriology, was already determined before the Incarnation.[2]

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.18.1, p. 446.

[2] Ibid., V.14.1, p. 541.

[3] Ibid., V.14.2, p. 541.

Since we have already discussed Christ's conflict and victory when we dealt with His Incarnation, Cross, and Resurrection,[3] it is not necessary to elaborate this aspect. Nonetheless, it is important to see Christ's conflict and victory in comparison with that of Adam. The basic difference between Adam and Christ is that

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.19.3, p. 449.

[2] Supra, p. 186. Typically Irenaean also is his explanation about the prophecies and foreknowledge in regard to the summing up through various arrangements: "Moreover, [with regard to] the other arrangements concerning the summing up that He should make, some of these they beheld through visions, others they proclaimed by word, while others they indicated typically by means of [outward] action, seeing visibly those things which were to be seen; heralding by word of mouth those which should be heard; and performing by actual operation what should take place by action; but [at the same time] announcing all prophetically." (Ibid., IV.20.8, p. 490). [ ] in the original.

[3] Supra, Pp. 184-216.

Christ overcame conflict whereas Adam was defeated. Precisely because of this difference, Christ was able to restore life that was lost in Adam's defeat. The Devil's destruction of man was accomplished in Adam because he was tempted and defeated by his disobedience, but in Christ that destruction was restored because of His obedience unto death.

Irenaeus describes extensively how the Lord became the counterpart of Adam in chapter 21 of the last book of Against Heresies. The recurring idea is that both Adam and Christ underwent the temptation of Satan, but with different results. Christ was able to carry off a glorious and perfect victory because He did not surrender to the Devil's temptings.

> He has therefore, in His work of recapitulation, summed up all things, both waging war against our enemy, and crushing him who had at the beginning led us away captives in Adam, and trampled upon his head, as thou canst perceive in Genesis that God said to the serpent, "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; He shall be on the watch for (observabit) thy head, and thou on the watch for His heel."[1]

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.21.1, p. 548. Scripture passage Gen. 3:15.

Christ was tempted and victory ensued. This also means that Christ's ethical struggle occupies an important place in his work of salvation. Thus once again we can affirm that it is wrong to think that in Irenaeus salvation is achieved through the physical Incarnation.

Closely related to the parallelism between Adam and Christ, is the parallelism between Eve and the Virgin. Irenaeus compares the disobedient and sinning Eve with the Virgin Mary.

> And thus, as the human race fell into bondage to death by means of a virgin, so is it rescued by a virgin; virginal disobedience having been balanced in the opposite scale by virginal obedience. For in the same way the sin of the first created man (protoplasti) receives amendment by the correction of the First-begotten, and the coming of the serpent is conquered by the harmlessness of the dove, those bonds being unloosed by which we had been fast bound to death.[1]

Indeed we find many passages in which Irenaeus describes the parallelism between Eve and Mary. To quote one other passage from his other writing, Proof of the Apostolic Preaching,

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.19.1, p. 547. Also see III.22.4, p. 455. "In accordance with this design, Mary the Virgin is found obedient, saying, 'Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word.' But Eve was disobedient; for she did not obey when as yet she was a virgin."

> And just as it was through a virgin who disobeyed that man was stricken and fell and died, so too it was through the Virgin, who obeyed the Word of God, that man resuscitated by life received by life. [sic] For the Lord came to seek back the lost sheep, and it was man who was lost, and therefore He did not become some other formation, but He likewise, of her that was descended from Adam, preserved the likeness of formation; for Adam had necessarily to be restored in Christ, that mortality be absorbed in immortality, and Eve in Mary, that a virgin, become the advocate of a virgin, should undo and destroy virginal disobedience by virginal obedience.[1]

Irenaeus has a passage similar to this in Against Heresies III.21.10 in which he makes an analogy between the formation of Adam from "virgin soil" and Christ's virgin birth.

> If, then, the first Adam had a man for his father, and was born of human seed, it were reasonable to say that the second Adam was begotten of Joseph. But if the former was taken from the dust, and God was his Maker, it was incumbent that the latter also, making a recapitulation in Himself, should be formed as man by God, to have an analogy with the former as

---

[1] Proof of the Apostolic Preaching, 33, p. 69.

> respects His origin. Why, then, did not God again take dust, but wrought so that the formation should be made of Mary? It was that there might not be another formation called into being, nor any other which should [require to] be saved, but that the very same formation should be summed up [in Christ as had existed in Adam], the analogy having been preserved.[1]

Irenaeus makes another interesting comparison between Adam and Christ, that is, he makes an analogy between Adam's death and Christ's death. Adam's death was due to his disobedience and so his death brought forth death to men, while that of Christ brought life because it was a death of obedience.

> For by summing up in Himself the whole human race from the beginning to the end, He has also summed up its death. From this it is clear that the Lord suffered death, in obedience to His Father, upon that day on which Adam died while he disobeyed God. Now he died on the same day in which he did eat. For God said, "In that day on which ye shall eat of it, ye shall die by death." The Lord therefore, recapitulating in Himself this day, underwent His sufferings upon the day preceding the Sabbath, that is, the sixth day of the creation, on which day man was created; thus granting him a second creation by means of His passion, which is that [creation] out of death.[2]

---

[1] *Against Heresies*, III.20.10, p. 454. [ ] in the original.

[2] *Ibid.*, V.23.2, p. 551. [ ] in the original.

The aspect of recapitulation as "restoration" means to restore man to his original condition.[1] Reversing the process whereby sin infected the earth, Christ granted men a second creation, by which He brought newness. According to Pauline theory, salvation is neither a natural nor human solution to man's problems but an historical action of God. It is so described in Col. 1:13; "He has delivered us from the dominion of darkness and transferred us to the Kingdom of his beloved Son." Obviously Irenaeus subscribes to this concept of restoration and renewal.

The newness which Christ brought was universal and all inclusive. It is inclusive in terms of time; it includes past, present and future. In a sense, in this inclusive work of Christ, the notion of time is altogether transcended, not in the philosopher's sense, but in the sense that the entire time process is included in a single all-inclusive event of Christ. Thus the "summing up" of Christ goes back to Adam and includes all his descendants:

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.12.6, p. 539.

> It was necessary, therefore, that the Lord, coming to the lost sheep, and making recapitulation of so comprehensive a dispensation, and seeking after His own handiwork, should save that very man who had been created after His image and likeness, that is, Adam, filling up the times of His condemnation, which had been incurred through his disobedience,--times "which the Father had placed in His own power."[1]

Often Irenaeus bases his defense of this inclusive and universal effect of recapitulation on the collective nature of man. In other words, Irenaeus maintains that if Adam represents the entire mankind as the first created man of God and put his descendants into the captivity of the enemy, naturally the second Adam liberates the entire mankind, including Adam himself.[2] Irenaeus specifically stresses that it is only logical for Adam to be included in God's work of salvation, as opposed to Tatian who denied the salvation of Adam.[3] Thus argues Irenaeus,

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.23.1, p. 455. Scripture passage Acts 1:7.

[2] Beuzart remarks, "Jesus Christ is the Incarnation of the Word. He is also the Incarnation of the race. He unites in His person the totality of the human race. Adam is a man and he also represents the humanity. Jesus Christ is a man and at the same time he represents the humanity. He is all at once an individual and all mankind. He is a recapitulation." (op.cit., p. 107) My translation from French.

[3] Against Heresies, III.23, p. 455.

> But this is Adam, if the truth should be told, the first formed man, of whom the Scripture says that the Lord spake, "Let us make man after Our own image and likeness"; and we are all from him: and as we are from him, therefore have we all inherited his title. But inasmuch as man is saved, it is fitting that he who was created the original man should be saved. For it is too absurd to maintain, that he who was so deeply injured by the enemy, and was the first to suffer captivity, was not rescued by Him who conquered the enemy, but that his children were,--those whom he had begotten in the same captivity.[1]

We must be careful, however, lest we should interpret Irenaeus in such a way that Adam's sin and the grace of Christ can be measured the same. Like Paul, Irenaeus sees a formal identity between Adam's sin and Christ's grace, but at the same time he renders greater power to the grace of Christ.[2]

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.23.2, p. 456.

[2] Rom. 5:15 "But the free gift is not like the trespass. For if many died through one man's trespass, much more have the grace of God and the free gift in the grace of that one man Jesus Christ abounded for many." The exegesis of this verse by Karl Barth is in agreement with Irenaeus' concept of grace in comparison with Adam's sin. Barth writes, "...grace is not to be measured by sin; in spite of the formal identity between them, the sin of Adam is not comparable with the grace of Christ." (Christ and Adam: Man and Humanity in Romans 5, trans. by T. A. Small, Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional papers No. 5 [Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1956], p. 11).

The incomparably greater power of Christ will be more clearly seen as we discuss Irenaeus' teaching of deification. What is expressed in this teaching is that by recapitulation of Christ, man was not only brought back to the place from which he had departed, but that he will also arrive where he is destined to arrive. The recapitulation is not only the restoration of the original creation, but also the achievement of the creation, or the perfection of the creation. It is "summing up in Himself the whole human race from the beginning to the end."[1] Then it becomes obvious that recapitulation is more than strict parallelism between Adam and Christ.[2]

Another idea of Irenaeus which underlies the universal aspect of the recapitulation is his idea of creation through Logos. He describes the recapitulation as the manner in which imperfect creation finally achieves perfection through the Logos in which everything was created. In this case, Irenaeus also manages to relate the doctrine of creation to the doctrine of redemption. The following passage confirms this:

---

[1] Against Heresies, V.23.2, p. 551.

[2] See Andres Benoit, op.cit., p. 229. He has a good interpretation on this point.

> And because He is Himself the Word of God Almighty, who in His invisible form pervades us universally in the whole world, and encompasses both its length and breadth and height and depth--for by God's Word everything is disposed and administered--the Son of God was also crucified, imprinted in the form of a cross on the universe; for He had necessarily, in becoming visible, to bring to light the universality of His cross, in order to show openly through His visible form that activity of His: that it is He who makes bright the height, that is, what is in heaven, and holds the deep, which is in the bowels of the earth, and stretches forth and extends the length from East to West, navigating also the Northern parts and the breadth of the South, and calling in all the dispersed from all sides to the knowledge of the Father.[1]

Then the redemption which is so closely related to the Logos who is the very creating power through whom the entire universe was created is naturally cosmic and all inclusive. In other words, when Christ acted he redeemed not only men but the entire creation.[1]

---

[1] Proof of the Apostolic Preaching, 34, pp. 69-70. Cf. Justin, "I Apology," 60, p. 185 and ibid., 55, p. 181. It is also interesting to compare this with Against Heresies, II.24.4, p. 395, and John 11:51 and 12:32.

Irenaeus presents another impressive idea in his expounding of recapitulation as universal. He naturally manages to relate his ecclesiology to his theory of recapitulation. We have already discussed Irenaeus' teaching that the Church is the body of Christ in which the activity of the Holy Spirit is continued. In a number of passages Irenaeus clearly expresses the idea of extending Christ's work of recapitulation to the Spirit through the Church. It is through the Church's faith in one God the Father, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and the Holy Spirit that the work of "gathering all things in one" is carried on.[2] It is precisely this universal validity and character of the faith of the Church that makes the Church universal.

> And undoubtedly the preaching of the Church is true and stedfast, in which one and the same way of salvation is shown throughout the whole world. For to her is entrusted

---

[1] At this point, we are reminded that a person like Galloway criticizes Irenaeus for the weak notion of the cosmic redemption. (Supra, p. 136). In fact, however, Irenaeus' use of the Logos doctrine in close relation to the Christ-event enables him to speak of the cosmic redemption.

[2] Supra, p. 248.

> the light of God, and therefore the "wisdom" of God, by means of which she saves all men. . . . For the Church preaches the truth everywhere, and she is the seven-branched candlestick which bears the light of Christ.[1]

Then logically the perfection of creation means that the Church embraces the entire creation. By being called into the Church man is saved, because it is in the Church that Christ recapitulates man, uniting him with the Spirit.

> Into this paradise the Lord has introduced those who obey His call, "summing up in Himself all things which are in heaven, and which are on earth"; but the things in heaven are spiritual, while those on earth constitute the dispensation in human nature (secundum hominem est dispositio). These things, therefore, He recapitulated in Himself; by uniting man to the Spirit, and causing the Spirit to be the head of man: for through Him (the Spirit) we see, and hear, and speak.[2]

In fact, the idea of recapitulation is so closely related to the entire scheme of Irenaeus' ecclesiology that a person like Emile Mersch makes the following remark:

---

[1] *Against Heresies*, V.20.1, p. 548.

[2] *Ibid.*, V.20.2, p. 548. ( ) in the original. Scripture passage Eph. 1:10.

> We may say that the idea of the Mystical Body contained in the idea of recapitulation constitutes the center of the theology of St. Irenaeus.[1]

Mersch also emphasizes the relation between the Church and the Spirit in this manner:

> The Church is the Spirit's field of activity. To her He communicates an eternal renewal and through the ages He is to her what the life-giving breath of God was to creation.[2]

It is in this connection with the Church that the idea of recapitulation as an activity is made evident. Moreover, by relating the recapitulation of Christ with the economy of the Holy Spirit, we have a well-balanced doctrine of redemption which harmonizes the theory of recapitulation with the doctrine of man whose perfection is achieved only through growth. At this point, it is important to reconsider the aspect of recapitulation as restoration to the original condition of creation. We are reminded that Irenaeus describes Adam before the Fall as an infant who needs to grow. Then if recapitulation has undone the effect of the Fall, it means that man has resumed his growth by recapitulation; recapitulation does not mean that man was made perfect all at once, even though his perfection is decided in that act of the recapitulator, Christ.

---

[1] Emile Mersch, S.J., The Whole Christ : The Historical Development of the Doctrine of the Mystical Body in Scripture and Tradition. trans. by John R. Kelly. (London: Dennis Dobson, 1949), p. 232.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 236.

In this setting of our discussion, we have perfect harmony between the finished work of Christ and the divinely active work of the Holy Spirit in the theory of recapitulation as an activity. At the same time, we see that the theory of man who is destined to grow, the doctrine of the Church as the body of Christ that exists between the finished work of Christ and the end of the time, and the doctrine of redemption which is strongly eschatological--all fit together and present us with a wholesome theology.

It is in the theory of recapitulation as an activity which will be completed at the end that we discern the aspect of recapitulation that is inseparably related to the concept of conflict and growth. We have seen that in the victory of Christ, essentially recapitulation consists in the restoration of the divine image that was lost at the Fall. Perhaps we may designate this part as the physical theory of redemption.

When we consider that the victory was obtained through conflict, we discern the moral aspect of recapitulation. This is to say that Christ's ethical struggle occupies an important place in His recapitulation. In his theory of recapitulation, Irenaeus makes it plain that it is in Christ that we find our victory over sin and death.[1] At the same time, he also manages to give an important place to man's ethical struggle. What makes it possible for him to hold these two ideas simultaneously is his view on man's growth and his doctrine that the Church is the place where the work of Christ is continued by the Holy Spirit. Now we can hardly say that Irenaeus tends to hold a physical theory of redemption: in his theory of recapitulation, we see a combination of physical and moral theories of redemption.

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.23.1, p. 455. "But as much as God is invincible and long-suffering, He did indeed show Himself to be long-suffering in the matter of the correction of man and the probation of all, . . ."

In the aspect of recapitulation as an activity, i.e., man's ethical struggle toward his growth, we have an individual recapitulation. This point is directly related to the doctrine of the Church and her sacraments, because the redemption of the individual is effected by the Church and her sacraments in the name of Christ. Quasten makes an appropriate remark, saying,

> The sacrament is to nature what the new Adam is to the old. A creature receives its perfection in the sacraments. The sacrament is the climax of the recapitulation of creation in Christ.[1]

Thus Irenaeus' anthropology and ecclesiology were consistent with his theory of recapitulation. Moreover, in his scheme of recapitulation, the economy of the Son and the Spirit are well-balanced. And two of his basic assumptions of his anthropology, viz., the freedom of man and the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit are well-depicted in the recapitulation as the restoration of man and as man's continuing growth through conflict and ethical struggle.

At this point, it is interesting to notice that Paul uses the term, ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, in two senses.

---

[1] Quasten, op.cit., Vol. 1, p. 311.

We have dealt with the aspect which is depicted in Ephesians 1:10. There is, however, another passage of St. Paul where we find the term, ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται. It reads, τὸ γὰρ Οὐ μοιχεύσεις, Οὐ φονεύσεις, Οὐ κλέψεις, Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, καὶ εἴ τις ἑτέρα ἐντολή, εν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται, [ἐν τῷ] Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν. (Rom. 13:9).

Obviously in this case, recapitulation is applied to the commandment of love. Even though Irenaeus does not directly make use of this passage in his exposition of recapitulation, actually Irenaeus includes the meaning of recapitulation expressed in this passage. He writes,

> For as we do direct our faith towards the Son, so also should we possess a firm and immovable love towards the Father.[1]

---

[1] *Against Heresies*, IV.6.2, p. 468. Also see *Supra*, p. 278 In the passage of Justin which Irenaeus quoted, the importance of an individual's love and faith for the Father in relation to the recapitulation of Christ is well expressed. Also see the article by Adehmar d'Ales on "La Doctrine de la Récapitulation en Saint Irénée," p. 188. Here he expounds two verses of St. Paul and designates recapitulation in Ephesians 1:10 as "cosmique" and that in Romans as "logique," (*Recherches de Science Religieus*, [Paris: Aux Bureaux de la Revue 6-7 Annees, 1916])pp. 185-211.

An implication in this passage points to an inseparable relation between the Son who brings the objective redemption and the believer's love for the Father. The love for the Father is, of course, never complete without the love for the neighbor. Here again we can see that Irenaeus consistently preserves the importance of the moral and ethical aspect of recapitulation. We may conclude that in Irenaeus' theory of recapitulation, we have a cosmic and collective as well as individual aspect of recapitulation.

ii. Incorruption Through Life

In studying the doctrine of recapitulation in Irenaeus, we find that death and life are constantly contrasted. In the early Church, the doctrine of recapitulation dealt much more radically with the antithesis of life and death as the fundamental antithesis of human existence. This is obviously true with Irenaeus in his doctrine of recapitulation.

Irenaeus often asserts that what man lost by being injured by the serpent was life, and the outcome of losing life was death. Therefore, death is not something natural, because man was created to live. Furthermore, to leave man in death is to allow the power of the Evil One to prevail over the will of God the Redeemer. In this context, Irenaeus attributes the salvation of man to the restoration of life from death. Thus he writes,

> For if man, who had been created by God that he might live, after losing life, through being injured by the serpent that had corrupted him, should not any more return to life, but should be utterly [and forever] abandoned to death, God would [in that case] have been conquered, and the wickedness of the serpent would have prevailed over the will of God . . . and by means of the second man did He bind the strong man, and spoiled his goods,* --and abolished death vivifying that man who had been in a state of death.[1]

It is especially in dealing with the antithesis of life and death that Irenaeus expresses dualism between the Evil One and Christ, the victory going to Christ.

In other words, for Irenaeus, restoring man to life means to conquer the foe of life. It is well expressed in the following passage:

> Now Adam had been conquered, all life having been taken away from him: wherefore, when the foe was conquered in his turn, Adam received new life; and the last enemy, death is destroyed, which at the first had taken possession of man. Therefore, when man has been liberated, "What is written

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.23.1, pp. 455-456. *See Scripture passage in Matthew 12:29. [ ] in the original.

> shall come to pass, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy victory? O death, where is thy sting?" This could not be said with justice, if that man, over whom death did first obtain dominion, were not set free. For his salvation is death's destruction. When therefore the Lord vivifies man, that is, Adam, death is at the same time destroyed.[1]

Life and death are mutually exclusive in the sense that they cannot co-exist. Thus writes Irenaeus,

> For as the flesh is capable of corruption, so is it also of incorruption; and as it is also of life. These two do mutually give way to each other; and both cannot remain in the same place, but one is driven out by the other, and the presence of the one destroys that of the other.[2]

The life restored by driving away death is much more powerful than the power of death, because it not only takes death away from man but it also leads man to immortality, the immortality of a whole person.

> If, then, when death takes possession of a man, it drives life away from him, and proves him to be dead, much more does life, when it has obtained power over the man, drive out death, and restore him as living unto God.[3]

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.23.7, p. 457.

[2] Ibid., V.12.1, p. 537.

[3] Ibid., V.12.1, p. 537.

Thus, Irenaeus logically leads to the conclusion that if death brings mortality, then life brings immortality. The means by which we attain immortality is to be united to Life Himself who became man in order to swallow up corruptibility and mortality so that we may obtain incorruptibility and immortality.[1] Then to be separated from Christ means to be deprived of life and to remain in an unnatural state, because life and immortality are not states which man can attain by his own virtue; they are bestowed by Christ.

We have often noted that Irenaeus constantly stresses the resurrection of the flesh, thus including the immortality of body as well as soul and spirit.[2] It is interesting to notice that Irenaeus makes use of the healings of Jesus in his argument for the resurrection of the flesh. Jesus performed all kinds of healing on men who were impaired by wickedness. His purpose of healing the different portions of the flesh was to restore them to the original condition, finally preparing them for the resurrection.

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.19.1, p. 448.

[2] It is worth noticing that sometimes Irenaeus speaks of the natural immortality of the spirit and soul, and so it is only the body which can be touched by the dissolution of death. Thus he writes in the Against Heresies V.7.1, pp. 532-533: "What, then, are mortal bodies? Can they be souls? Nay, for souls are incorporeal when put in comparison with mortal bodies; for God 'breathed into the face of man the breath of life, and man became a living soul.' Now the breath of life is an incorporeal thing. And certainly they cannot maintain that the very breath of life is mortal. Therefore, David says, 'My soul also shall live in Him,' just as if its substance were immortal.

> He, therefore, who confers healing, the same does also confer life; and He who gives life, also surrounds His own handiwork with incorruption.[1]

Thus every action of Jesus is significant and directed toward the final salvation of men. In conclusion, we can say that Irenaeus deals with the doctrine of recapitulation in the light of the antithesis of life and death.

Neither, on the other hand, can they say that the spirit is the mortal body. What therefore is there left to which we may apply the term 'mortal body,' unless it be the thing that was moulded, that is, the flesh, of which it is also said that God will vivify it?" On the basis of this passage, Nygren points out the inconsistency of Irenaeus, saying, "He is surely inconsistent here. He sees in principle the danger of the Hellenistic theory and opposes it, but cannot in practice get rid of its influence." (op.cit., p. 406) Irenaeus' own passage quoted sounds like he deserves this kind of criticism, but what he is really trying to do is to emphasize the real death of the body and accordingly the real resurrection of the body.

[1] Against Heresies, V.12.6, p. 539.

What was brought by the recapitulation of Christ was life and He bestowed that life by uniting men to Himself. In this case, recapitulation can be interpreted as "interpenetration." We will be able to elaborate this point as we proceed in our discussion to "deification."

3. Deification

i. Becoming Man in Christ

According to Irenaeus' teleological anthropology, recapitulation is the manner in which the imperfect creation finally achieves perfection. In other words, the climax of recapitulation is the manner in which man reaches his goal by the operation of the Triune God.

Irenaeus describes man's final state of achieving salvation as "becoming sons of God." The way in which man becomes a son of God is described in those passages where the aspect of recapitulation as "interpenetration" is found. The union of the Logos (the uncreated nature) with man (the created nature) enables the communion between God and man, and unites man to God so that man may become the son of God.

> For it was for this end that the Word of God was made man, and He who was

> the Son of God became the Son of man, that man, having been taken into the Word, and receiving the adoption, might become the son of God.[1]

In the final analysis, what is involved in Christ's becoming man is man's being adopted as the son of God by the unique action of God in history. For Irenaeus, becoming a son of God means to attain to the image and likeness of God, the perfection of which the first man only potentially possessed, but was finally found in Christ. Irenaeus describes this in the following manner:

> For we cast blame upon Him, because we have not been made gods from the beginning, but at first merely men, then at length gods; although God has adopted this course out of His pure benevolence, that no one may impute to Him invidiousness, or grudgingness. He declares, "I have said, Ye are all gods; and ye are all sons of the Highest." But since we could not sustain the power of divinity, He adds, "But ye shall die like men," setting forth both truths--the kindness of His free gift,

---

[1] Against Heresies, III.19.1, p. 448. The Greek text reads:"εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ὁ λόγος ἄνθρωπος, . . . ἵνα ὁ ἄνθρωπος τὸν λόγον χωρήσας, καὶ τὴν υἱοθεσιαν λαβὼν υἱὸς γένηται θεοῦ." (Harvey, op.cit., Vol. II, p. 103) Also see Ibid., III.16.3, p. 441. ". . . and that Jesus Christ was appointed the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead, as being the first begotten in all the creation; the Son of God being made the Son of man, that through Him we may receive the adoption,--humanity sustaining, and receiving, and embracing the Son of God."

> and our weakness, and also that we were possessed of power over ourselves. For after His great kindness He graciously conferred good [upon us], and made men like to Himself, [that is] in their own power; while at the same time by His prescience He knew the infirmity of human beings, and the consequences which would flow from it, but through [His] love and [His] power, He shall overcome the substance of created nature. For it was necessary, at first, that nature should be exhibited; then, after that, that what was mortal should be conquered and swallowed up by immortality, and the corruptible by incorruptibility, and that man should be made after the image and likeness of God, having received the knowledge of good and evil.[1]

Here Irenaeus identifies "being made after the image and likeness of God" at the end with being made like gods. At this point, however, we must be careful lest we should interpret Irenaeus in such a way that his language of deification makes men the same with Christ. Of course, in a bond with the Holy Spirit which Christ confers on the believer, he overcomes the state of being merely an empirical human being. At the same time, "overcoming the state of being merely man" means being fully man as he was destined to become when he actually attains the perfection which was potential in the first man. It is precisely in this sense that the climax of recapitulation is more than the restoration to the original condition of creation before the Fall.

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.38.4, p. 522. [ ] in the original.

Irenaeus is never tired of saying that the final goal of man is to attain the image and likeness of God by the operation of the Triune God.[1] Until the final consummation, the work of creating will be continued by the Triune God, and man will be ascending gradually toward the perfect One by making progress day by day.

> By this arrangement, therefore, and these harmonies, and a sequence of this nature, man, a created and organized being, is rendered after the image and likeness of the uncreated One,--the Father planning everything well and giving His commands, the Son carrying these into execution and performing the work of creating, and the Spirit nourishing and increasing [what is made], but man making progress day by day, and ascending towards the perfect, that is approximating to the uncreated One. For the uncreated is perfect, that is, God.[2]

There are two essential ideas in Irenaeus' theory of deification. First, he believes that man does not become like God on his own merit but by the grace of God, even though man's response to his Lord and Saviour by the guidance of the Holy Spirit is significant. Secondly, deification does not mean that man becomes god, but that he becomes fully man in Christ. What Philippou says to be essential for the Greek Patristic tradition remains true with Irenaeus: "'only God can give God' makes it essential for the eastern tradition to affirm that no created reality can be commensurate with God."[1] In fact, deification is the only logical result of Irenaeus' doctrine of man whose perfect image was found not in the first man, but in Christ from the very beginning, and who was destined to grow toward that perfect image in Christ. In this connection, we find that Wingren's interpretation reflects a keen insight into Irenaeus when he writes,

---

[1] Cf. Laeuchli, *op.cit.*, p. 213.

[2] *Against Heresies*, IV.38.3, pp. 521-522. [ ] in the original.

> Man does not give up his existence as man and take up himself a different existence, viz. God's existence, while his human part disappears. . . . Irenaeus saw that in his present condition man is becoming no more than man. But according to God's decree in Creation man as man is to be like God, and when man becomes like God he is in actual fact becoming man.[2]

---

[1] A. J. Philippou, ed., The Orthodox Ethos, Vol. I (Oxford, England: Holywell Press, 1964), p. 94.

[2] Wingren, op.cit., p. 209.

The reason in part, why the language of deification is offensive to many scholars is that they misunderstand it. Interpreting the idea of deification as man's becoming god, some scholars point out that Irenaeus' teaching of deification is a piece of Hellenistic piety.[1]

David Cairns seriously doubts whether the description of the image as a reflection of God's glory, and in a sense a sharing of it, justifies the use by the early Greek theologians, especially Irenaeus, Athanasius and Clement of Alexandria, of the language of divinization. Then he interprets II Peter 1:14 which is in clear support of their views and concludes that what is implied in that New Testament passage is a mystical fellowship with the exalted Christ, but "not mystical absorption in Him or an absorption of the divine nature into oneself."[1] He writes,

---

[1] Bousset is a scholar who regards Irenaeus as distinctively Johannine and he holds a view that Irenaeus was influenced by Hellenistic piety. (Lawson, op.cit., p. 160). Cf. Quasten, op.cit., Vol. I, p. 311, "The redemption brought by the Son of God has liberated mankind from the slavery of Satan, sin, and death. Moreover, it has summed up the whole of mankind in Christ. It has effected a reunion with God, the adoption by God, and the assimilation by God. But Irenaeus avoids the word 'deification' θεοποίησις in this connection. He uses the terms 'to be attached to,' 'to adhere to God,' 'participare gloriae Dei,' but he avoids effacing the boundaries between God and man, as was customary in the pagan religions and in the Gnostic heresies."

> Now the gift of the Spirit does not imply the divinization of the believer, or of the Church. In this relation the Spirit remains the Lord, but is not fused with the believer.[2]

Obviously he thinks that by the language of divinization, the early Greek theologians are endangering the Lordship of the Spirit; he understands their language of divinization to mean man's obtaining the same nature with Christ, hence becoming God. At this point, we can point out that his criticism of the teaching of deification is due to his own misinterpretation of what is implied in deification. In other words, we may say that his criticism is not sound because it is not based on what is actually involved in the language of deification; to become like God and participate in his nature does not mean that man becomes God but that man becomes fully man by the grace of God.[1]

---

[1] David Cairns, op.cit., p. 42.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 43. II Peter 1:4, ". . . by which he has granted to us his precious and very great promises, that through these you may escape from the corruption that is in the world because of passion, and become partakers of the divine nature."

We may conclude that deification means becoming man in Christ and becoming man in Christ means man's attaining his perfection by the work of the Triune God. Soteriology reaches its climax in deification and it is in this sense that a perfect man is a man saved by Christ.

---

[1] See Philippou, The Orthodox Ethos, p. 94. He interprets the meaning of deification in the light of the eastern tradition which embraces the teachings of Irenaeus, Athanasius, the Cappadocians, etc. We would find that the kind of interpretation he offers can eliminate the anxiety that is expressed by a scholar like David Cairns. He writes, "As Fr. Florovosky points out, the term theosis is rather 'offensive' to the modern ear. If we take it ontologically, it is quite pretentious to speak of man's becoming God. But for the Fathers the ontological structure of Hellenistic metaphysics broke down at Nicaea, and the whole emphasis is now on God's unique action in history. Theosis is the part assigned to man in God's action; it involves election, adoption and participation, in which man communicates with the God who is 'wholly other.' In this existential communion of grace the whole created order realizes its being by the sanctifying presence of the Triune God. This way of understanding God's presence in Christ and His Church as permeating the entire created order means that one may interpret the doctrine of deification as truly affirming 'the triumph of grace in Jesus Christ.' It may be apposite to clarify in passing the precise relationship between the doctrine of deification and the concept of God's transcendence." Cf. Maurice Wiles, op.cit., p. 92.

ii. The Glory of God and the Glory of Man

The anthropology of Irenaeus leads us to the conclusion that the glory of man is God and to be united to God is to be fully man. Estrangement from God is, therefore, to be less than human. At the same time, the glory of God is a living man through whom God is revealed. Irenaeus writes,

> For the glory of God is a living man; and the life of man consists in beholding God. For if the manifestation of God which is made by means of the creation, affords life to all living in the earth, much more does that revelation of the Father which comes through the Word, give life to those who see God.[1]

The ultimate duty of man is to serve God and to love God who first loved us through His Son, Jesus Christ. In fact, one of the central theses of Irenaeus' theology is that God is known through His love, even though His greatness in unknown.

> . . . as regards His greatness, [He] is indeed unknown to all who have been made by Him (for no man has searched out His height, either among the ancients who

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.20.7, p. 490. See also Ibid., III.20.2, p. 450. "For the glory of man [is] God, but [His] works [are the glory] of God; and the receptacle of all His wisdom and power [is] man. Just as the physician is proved by his patients, so is God also revealed through men." [ ] in the original.

> have gone to their rest, or any of those who are now alive); but as regards His love, He is always known through Him by whose means He ordained all things. Now this is His Word, our Lord Jesus Christ, who in the last times was made a man among men, that He might join the end to the beginning, that is, man to God.[1]

The Christ-event is the ultimate symbol of His love for men. At the same time, it also displays God's power by overcoming the wickedness of the serpent and vivifying man.[2] Thus God's glory in terms of His love and omnipotence is centered in man. For man to manifest God's glory is to love Him and to love God is nothing less than becoming man in Christ. Irenaeus clearly expresses that the glory of man and His love for God always go together. "Now the more we have loved Him," writes Irenaeus, "the more glory shall we receive from Him, when we are continually in the presence of the Father."[3]

Now Irenaeus strongly states that man can obtain the glory of God in no other way than by serving God,[4] because by serving God man can remain in fellowship with God and retain his life. It is important to notice, however, that God does not demand man's service for His sake but for the benefit of man and his glory.

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.20.4, p. 488. [ ] in the original.

[2] Ibid., III.23.1, p. 455.

[3] Ibid., IV.13.3, p. 478.

[4] Ibid., IV.16.4, p. 482.

> Nor did He stand in need of our service when He ordered us to follow Him; but He thus bestowed salvation upon ourselves. For to follow the Saviour is to be a partaker of salvation. . . . Thus, also, service [rendered] to God does indeed profit God nothing, nor has God need of human obedience; but He grants to those who follow Him and serve Him life and incorruption and eternal glory, bestowing benefit upon those who serve [Him], because they do serve Him, and on His followers, because they do follow Him; but does not receive any benefit from them: for He is rich, perfect, and in need of nothing. But for this reason does God demand service from men, in order that, since He is good and merciful, He may benefit those who continue in His service. For as much as God is in want of nothing, so much does man stand in need of fellowship with God. For this is the glory of man, to continue and remain permanently in God's service.[1]

Thus man's fellowship with God is the very way of retaining his life; and the glory of man can be attained only by glorifying God. In this sense Irenaeus successfully demonstrates that God's omnipotence and man's glory are not two opposing factors, but they are two parallel factors which are put in juxtaposition. Precisely because of this reason, in Irenaeus' positive doctrine of man we find that Theocentricity is not lessened but increased.

---

[1] Against Heresies, IV.14.1, p. 478. [ ] in the original.

When man is deprived of his fellowship with God, he is becoming less than a man and fails to find his full identity as a man. Then the ultimate task of man is to remain in the love of God through Jesus Christ. Irenaeus states his most fundamental belief in the following manner:

> It is therefore better, as I have said, that one should have no knowledge whatever of any one reason why a single thing in creation has been made, but should believe in God, and continue in His love, than that, puffed up through knowledge of this kind, he should fall away from that love which is the life of man; and that he should search after no other knowledge except [the knowledge of] Jesus Christ the Son of God, who was crucified for us, than that by subtle questions and hair-splitting expressions he should fall into impiety.[1]

To quote another beautiful passage from Irenaeus,

---

[1] Against Heresies, II.26.1, p. 397. [ ] in the original.

> . . . and that we should truly love Him forever, seeing that he alone is our Father; while we hope ever to be receiving more and more from God, and to learn from Him, because He is good, and possesses boundless riches, a kingdom without end, and instruction that can never be exhausted.[1]

To be man is to love God in whose image and likeness man was created, and whose love and riches are limitless and boundless.

> Now where there exists an increase of love, there a greater glory is wrought out by the power of God for those who love Him.[3]

---

[1] Against Heresies, II.28.3, p. 400.

[2] *Ibid*., V.3.1, p. 529.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The problem of this dissertation is to define and describe the theological anthropology of Irenaeus of Lyons. The method employed is historical, descriptive, and analytical. In order to examine Irenaeus' anthropology in the historical context, chapter II deals with the second century Christian Church in general including Irenaeus' life and significance in the Church history.

The findings of our investigation of Irenaeus' theological anthropology follow:

1. The anthropology in Irenaeus must begin with God the Creator; his central thesis is that man constitutes a theological being whose origin, nature and goal are all in God. There is only one God the Creator who created man with His "Two Hands," i.e., the Word and the Spirit.

2. The man created by the Triune God is distinguished from the rest of creation. He was made in the image and likeness of God. Irenaeus' use of Gen. 1:26, "Let Us make man in Our image and likeness," has been much debated

among the scholars. i. Most of the scholars maintain that there is a definite distinction in the meaning of these two words, imago and similitudo (Ernst Klebba, Emil Brunner, David Cairns, Reinhold Niebuhr, etc.). ii. Gustaf Wingren asserts that it was a mistake to see a distinction in Irenaeus' understanding of imago and similitudo. iii. The present study concluded that a distinction exists between imago and similitudo requiring a re-interpretation of the distinction, not a rejection as Gustaf Wingren has done.

To elaborate our conclusion, we have related Irenaeus' understanding of imago and similitudo with his trichotomy; consisting of spirit, soul and body. These scholars who posited a definite distinction between imago and similitudo have related the spirit with similitudo and maintained that spirit is a supernatural gift of God added to human nature by His grace. Thus they have criticized Irenaeus for anticipating the later Roman Catholic distinction of nature and supernature. However, our careful analysis of Irenaeus' understanding of spirit, body and soul enabled us to conclude as following:

(1) The whole man is made of spirit, body and soul. Thus the spirit is not an addition but a part of the whole man, without which man cannot be human. (2) The whole man was made in the imago and similitudo of God. (3) There is a functional distinction between the spirit on the one hand and the body and soul on the other. In this case the image of God is equated with the body and soul aspect of the trichotomy. And the spirit is more closely related to the Spirit of God and is equated with the likeness of God. But the very fact that the body and soul are made in the image of God affirms that the creation of man was due to God's grace. Then it becomes impossible to say that the addition of the spirit is the supernatural added by the grace of God. (4) The distinction becomes legitimate morally rather than naturally. By equating the likeness of God with the spirit, Irenaeus stresses that man must grow through the Spirit of God. Man can be fully man only in relation to the Spirit.

3. To elaborate the meaning of the creation of man in the "image and likeness" of God, we may conclude that the image character is strongly expressed in his nature

as a rational and free being, especially in contrast to the rest of the creation. Irenaeus does not say that the image is only in the soul. For him the human unity of body and soul is natural and ontological. However, the full realization of Imago Dei is found only in the man whose likeness is restored in Christ and who continues to grow through the Spirit. Thus for Irenaeus man's nature does not exist in alienation from God; it is only in relation with God that the full meaning of man's existence can be found.

4. Man's dominion over irrational creatures concerns his freedom as expressed in the image of God. Irenaeus stresses also that man is responsible for his own behavior because of the freedom. Thus in the idea of freedom Irenaeus discovers both dominion and responsibility.

5. Irenaeus' understanding of the primal state of the first man is one of the fundamental aspects of his anthropology. He describes the first man as νήπιος. Indeed this childhood analogy is one of the fundamental points that was to characterize his doctrine of man as distinct from that of Augustine. The first man was imperfect in the sense that he was destined to grow into perfection,

but perfect in the sense that he was as innocent as a child. Thus Irenaeus, by stating man as νήπιος and his need to grow, presents a teleological or developmental anthropology.

6. Parallel with the idea of νήπιος and growth, and basic in Irenaeus' anthropology is that the perfect image of man is in Christ, not in Adam. The notion of Adam as νήπιος and the perfect image of man in Christ rather than in Adam are two correlative ideas, because the maturity of Adam is realized in Christ. Thus Irenaeus works out his anthropology in correlation to Christology.

7. When interpreting the Fall of man, Irenaeus introduces "the demonic structure of evil," in contrast to Augustine's "ethical vision of evil," by taking into account the iconotropy of the serpent in the Genesis narrative of the Fall. Irenaeus finds the ultimate origin of evil in the Devil, for he considers the Devil to be the real enemy of God who stood in opposition to God's plan from the beginning and caused man to fall. He describes the power of the Devil to be quite powerful and real; in this sense we see a definite tendency toward dualism in his thought. However, in terms of creating power and the final victory, there is no dualsim;

it is only God who will ultimately defeat the Evil One.

8. Irenaeus thinks of the Evil One as the lord of sin and death and the primal man as νήπιος whom the Devil could easily deceive. In this case Adam's Fall becomes less catastrophic than it is in Augustinian system. Accordingly we have a reduced estimate of the seriousness of Adam's sin. However, man is responsible for the tragic rule of the Devil since it is he who was tempted. For Irenaeus sin is something unnatural because it is an act committed by man against his Maker by disobeying Him and following the Devil.

9. In the light of Irenaeus' understanding of the relation between human free will and his sin, we assert that he does not believe in original sin in the proper sense of the word. Often Irenaeus stresses that sin is a matter of moral choice, not of inborn nature. This point presupposes his belief that the image of God was not lost after the Fall, even though the creative process toward the perfection of the likeness was interrupted. Thus man possessed of free will cannot share the guilt of Adam's disobedience. However, the notion of original

sin is not entirely absent in Irenaeus. He teaches that the Fall of Adam imposed the power of sin and death upon his descendants. He transcends a simple moralistic view of sin; he is not as optimistic as some of the modern liberal theologians. However, his belief in man's freedom makes him less pessimistic than Augustinians. Irenaeus stresses Adam's sin and its impact on his descendants to show the grace of Second Adam, Christ.

10. Irenaeus teaches that death resulted from man's Fall and often speaks of salvation as a bestowal of life. However, salvation is not only the victory over mortality but also the forgiveness of sin; Irenaeus' concept of sin and death points to man's defeat as "ethical" as well as "physical." If the Devil brought death to man under the pretext of immortality, man's defeat would be physical. If it is man's disobedience (sin) that allowed death, man's defeat would become ethical. Irenaeus also identifies life with obedience to God and death with disobedience to God; both life and death receive more meaning than mere existence and non-existence. Thus Irenaeus interprets death not only as the physical end of life, but as the state of man in sin.

11. Related to the teaching of sin is Irenaeus' concept of the law: i. For Irenaeus the term "natural" often meant "divine" in the sense that anything that is against God is unnatural. Thus the natural law is the law which all men have to keep in order to remain natural. The natural law concept that Irenaeus teaches should be understood theologically. His natural law concept is also related to one of his basic anthropological principles, i.e., man was created in the image of God endowed with free will. Man as a creature of God is naturally given the ability to order his conduct with respect to God. God made it natural for man to follow Him from the beginning as a way of salvation. Natural law is given to man in creation, ultimately for the salvation of man, because it is only natural for man to love God and his neighbor. Thus the divine law, expressed in the Decalogue, is virtually identified with the concept of natural law in Irenaeus.

ii. In connection with man's sin, Irenaeus associates the word "bondage" with the law. Jewish ceremonial law, for instance, was understood as bondage because it was necessary due to the sin of man. In this sense the law was a "bondage" but it was for the purpose of setting man free from the bondage of sin.

iii. The goodness of the law is seen in the "law of liberty," which is the new law. The new law which is brought in Christ is superior to the old, but there is a continuity between the old and the new. These successive covenants pertain to one of Irenaeus' basic anthropological premises, that is, the idea of growth; the continuity of the two covenants relates to man's gradual growth toward perfection. The new law which Christ brought leads men from a lower level of morality to a higher. And it is in the new covenant that men are finally saved, not in the old.

12. The real triumph of the theological anthropology of Irenaeus is that he makes the "economy of the Son" the very center of the anthropological truth. The pivot of the theological language of Irenaeus is the doctrine of the Incarnation; the Incarnation fulfilled all of God's dispensations, because it was God's coming to man and it was God's becoming man that man could be the son of God. In one sense the Incarnation is the perfection of the creation; the original creation and the new order in Christ

belong to a single divine plan. The creation is never perfect without God's redemptive work. In the Incarnation a single human being comes into existence, but this one man includes the entire creation and manifests the perfection of creation in a visible manner. To be specific, the purposes of the Incarnation are as follows: i. Word became flesh in order to reveal the Father. ii. God entered into communion with us in order for us to have communion with God. In this concext the grand purpose of the Incarnation was to combat the source of the enmity between God and man, i.e., the Devil.

13. Irenaeus stresses the double aspect of the Incarnation; in the Incarnation what is disclosed is perfect God and perfect man. However, the humanity which Christ discloses is what man ought to be, it is never what man actually is. Irenaeus already grasped the basic truth which became the common ground of all opponents of Arianism and established a strong foundation of the Chalcedonian doctrine.

14. One of the strengths of Irenaeus' Christology is that the entire life of Christ is treated as a continous process of a victorious conflict. However, it is on the

Cross that His conflict becomes most intense and His victory most glorious. In His atonement on the Cross, two things occur, i.e., doing away with the origin of man's sin, the Devil, and forgiveness of man's sin. The real motive of the atonement was to express God's love for man. Had not God loved man enough to forgive his sin, He would not have taken up the human suffering on the Cross to conquer the Evil One for the purpose of healing man. Christ demonstrates the attainment of the image of God, i.e., the true humanity, by taking the form of a servant emptying Himself. The love of God reaches a climax on the Cross, because it is there that man encounters God who does not refuse the pain of being human.

15. The true victory of death on the Cross is manifest in the Resurrection of Christ. The Resurrection of Christ was the surest example of the final victory over death and was a proof of ours. If death is an unnatural and destructive power, the Resurrection of Christ means the restoration of life. Christ's Resurrection is not something exclusively supernatural. Hence it becomes only natural for us to see the prime example of our resurrection in that of Christ. The resurrection of our flesh is no more

a miracle than the creation, if not less. The resurrection hope presupposes the faith in creation.

In Irenaeus' language of resurrection, two points are made clear: i. The fully redeemed life will include a whole man, who was created by God to remain an embodied spirit. ii. The life after death is not due to the inherently immortal nature of man's soul, but it is wholly the gift of God.

16. The eschatological vision of Irenaeus and his emphasis on the Christ event lead him to speak of the Church as existing "in between times." Christ is the head of the Church and her members the body of Christ. Hence the entrance to life is the Church, but the Church is earthly because the Church exists everywhere on earth as the sole repository of truth. Thus Irenaeus equates ἐκκλησία and ἀλήθεια; the truth which the Church has inherited from the apostles is about the Father Almighty, One Christ Jesus, the Son of God and the Holy Spirit.

The important sacraments of the Church are baptism and eucharist. i. The members of the Church receive the canon of truth by means of baptism; in this case the canon of truth is identified with the baptismal creed. Baptism involves two elements: (1) remission of sin and (2) rebirth in Christ, participating in the new creation. Thus as entrance to life, baptism is the beginning of the long journey toward perfection.

ii. The eucharist becomes a sacrament in which the new life, commenced in baptism, continues. It is the incarnate and risen Lord who imparts His life to His followers by baptism and nourishment by the eucharist. Irenaeus teaches the following points in regard to the eucharist: (1) He teaches the realism of the eucharist; in the eucharist the bread and wine consist of two realities, earthly and heavenly, being turned into the body and blood of Christ. (2) The eucharist is an oblation which ultimately renews the whole of the mystery of the atonement on the Cross. In this aspect of the eucharist Irenaeus emphasizes the following points: a. Eucharist as the offering of the first fruits--here the notion of "thanksgiving " is included. b. The act of sacrifice is for the benefit of the offerer. c. The notion of passion as an event of the present offering of the eucharist is present. It is the ἀνάμνησις of that once for all event at Calvary.

17. For Irenaeus justification alone does not constitute a complete soteriology. A saved man is he who is born again in Christ and sanctified by the Holy Spirit. Often the economy of Christ and that of the Spirit are complementary. But when we deal with the Church as the body of Christ--Christ as the head of the body--the Holy Spirit enters particularly as the Spirit of Christ. The Holy Spirit is He who continues the work of Christ in the Church. Thus it is not so much in the sense of inter-Trinitarian relationship but in the economy of the Son and that of the Holy Spirit that the Spirit is the Spirit of Christ.

However, the economy of the Holy Spirit has a very distinctive place in Irenaeus' soteriology. It is the Spirit who makes His dwelling-place in man and leads man toward perfection. Christ bestows the Spirit on man as His work of salvation, and in turn the Spirit unites man with Christ.

18. In Irenaeus the notion of reward and judgment is strong. Closely related to this point is the stress on human freedom and responsibility. Because man is a

free being, he is responsible for both his punishment and reward. Because God is both good and just, He punishes the wicked and blesses the pious. Irenaeus teaches the following points in regard to reward and judgments:

i. Reward and judgment as continous and present: man's present life and the consequences of his own conduct and attitude toward life are something that he has to face in the present life.

ii. The great judgment at the second coming of the Lord: (1) Irenaeus teaches the earthly Kingdom of the Lord in a literal sense; he speaks of the reign of Christ with His risen saints in His earthly Kingdom. We can presuppose three reasons for this teaching: a. The Gnostic tendency to dissolve Christian eschatology into the myth of soul's ascending to the place of its origin. b. His belief in history in which Christ's saving work is carried on and his conviction that the suffering of Christians will be rewarded abundantly within history. c. His nonspeculative use of ἐκκλησία.

(2) At the end of the earthly Kingdom of the Son, there will be God's judgment for those who followed the Evil One, and the ultimate reward for the just ones. The Punishment

of the ungodly will be the eternal separation from God, and the reward for the just ones will be life eternal.

19. One of the central teachings of Irenaeus is his doctrine of recapitulation. We find the following meanings in this doctrine: i. The idea of "restoration" by Christ of whatever the primal man lost by his disobedience. (1) Parallelism between Adam and Second Adam, Christ. (2) Reversing the process whereby sin infected the earth, Christ granted men a second creation by which He brought newness. The newness which Christ brought was universal and all inclusive in terms of time; it includes past, present, and future. There is a formal identity between Adam's sin and Christ's grace, but the latter is greater than the former.

ii. Recapitulation as the "achievement" of the creation. Thus it is "summing up in Himself the whole human race from the beginning to the end." The pertaining ideas to this aspect of recapitulation follow: (1) The recapitulation as the manner in which imperfect creation finally achieves perfection through Logos. (2) The perfection of creation means that the Church embraces the entire creation. It is in the Church that Christ recapitulates man, uniting him with the Spirit.

iii. The idea of recapitulation as an "activity." The meanings implied in this aspect follow: (1) If recapitulation has undone the effect of the Fall, it means that man has resumed his growth by recapitulation. (2) There is a continuity between the finished work of Christ and the divinely active work of the Holy Spirit, between the theory of man as νήπιος and one who is destined to grow, and between the Church existing "in between times" and the final consummation. (3) There is a notion of individual recapitulation which gives an important place to man's ethical struggle toward his growth.

iv. Recapitulation as "interpenetration": Christ bestowed life by uniting man to Himself.

20. Related to the aspect of recapitulation as interpenetration appears the idea of deification. Deification implies the following points: i. The final state of man's salvation is to become a son of God. What is involved in Christ's becoming human is man's being adopted as the

son of God by the unique action of God in history.

ii. Becoming a son of God means the perfect attainment of the image and likeness of God. The formation of man according to the image and likeness entails his being made like God. There are two essential ideas in this theory of being made like God: (1) Man does not become like God on his own merit but by the grace of God; man's response is secondary. (2) Deification does not mean that man becomes God in the sense of being identical with His Being, but that he becomes fully man in Christ by the power of His Spirit. To conclude, deification means becoming man in Christ, i.e., his attaining of perfection by the work of the Triune God.

21. The positive anthropology of Irenaeus does not lessen the Theocentricity; for the glory of man is God, and unification with God constitutes the fulfillment of his humanity. Simultaneously, God's glory, mediated in His love and omnipotence, focuses in man. The glory of man can be attained only by glorifying God. Thus God's omnipotence and man's glory are not two opposing factors, but they are parallel. The retention of a full human identity involves fellowship with God. To be man is to love God

in whose image and likeness man was created, and whose love and riches are boundless and limitless.

22. We can detect some minor weaknesses in Irenaeus' anthropology. For example, the power of evil is vanquished in so far as the eternal life of the righteous ones is preserved; but what about those who fall under God's negative judgment and are eternally separated from God? By holding "the demonic structure of evil," he offers a positive alternative to the Christians who are distorted and bewildered by the problem of evil. However, he leaves a sense of incompleteness in his exposition of the Evil One and the victory brought by Christ due to his strong argument on God's judgment. He speaks of God's judgment in such strong terms to balance man's freedom with his responsibility, and God's justice with His goodness; but in the final analysis the victory of Christ seems to be incomplete with some people remaining unsaved. We also detect some internal contradiction. A strong idea of universal salvation appears in his doctrine of recapitualtion. Here he successfully demonstrates God's omnipotence and love; but it is not consistent with his argument that there will be some people who will be submitted

to God's eternal judgment and will be eternally separated from Him.

To conclude, however, we can say that Irenaeus made a positive contribution to Christianity by presenting a theological anthropology that does away with Gnostic distortions as it tries to present the kerygmatic message with integrity. The Gnostics in their attempt to give a more philosophical foundation to the theology of revelation did away with the experience of tradition arguing primarily in terms of a more personal faith. The momentous contribution Irenaeus makes to Christian theology in general is in his insistence upon arguing from the data of revelation, upon remaining within the framework of ecclesiastical tradition and upon emphasizing the historical and eschatological elements of the basic Christian doctrines.

The eternal plan of God and the sense of His acting in history for man spell out the essence of Irenaeus' teleological anthropology. Furthermore, the real triumph of God's grace is manifest in his doctrine of recapitulation and deification. Thus in his anthropology Irenaeus leaves us with the ultimate task of loving God whose grace is infinite.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Altaner, Berthold. *Patrology*. Translated by Hilda C. Graef. New York: Herder and Herder, 1961.

Aulen, Gustaf. *Christus Victor: An Historical Study of the Three Main Types of the Idea of Atonement*. Translated by A. G. Hebert. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951.

______________. *Eucharist and Sacrifice*. Trnaslated by Eric H. Wahlstrom. Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1958.

______________. *The Faith of the Christian Church*. Translated from the fourth Swedish edition by Eric H. Wahlstrom and G. Everett Arden. Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1948.

Athanasius. "On the Incarnation of the Word." *Christology of the Later Fathers*. Vol. III of *The Library of Christian Classics*. Edited by Edward Rochie Hardy. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1945.

Augustine. "The Confessions." Translated by J. G. Pilkington. *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. Edited by Philip Schaff. Vol. I. Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956.

________. "The City of God." Translated by Marcus Dods. "Christian Doctirne." Translated by J. F. Shaw. *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. Edited by Philip Schaff. Vol. II. Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956.

_________. "The Enchiridon." Translated by J. F. Shaw. "On the Trinity." Translated by Arthur West Haddan. *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. Edited by Philip Schaff. Vol. III. Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956.

Barth, Karl. *Christ and Adam: Man and Humanity in Romans 5.* Translated by T. A. Small. *Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers No. 5*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1956.

Beaven, James. *An Account of the Life and Writings of S. Irenaeus*. London: J. G. & J. Rivington, 1841.

Bettenson, Henry. ed. & trans. *The Early Christian Fathers: A Selection from the Writings of the Fathers from St. Clement of Rome to St. Augustine*. London; New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Beuzart, Paul. *Essai sur la Théologie D'Irénée*. Paris: Le Puyen-Velay, 1908.

Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *Creation and Fall: A Theological Interpretation of Genesis 1-3*. London: SCM Press, 1959.

Bonwetsch, G. Nathanael. *Die Theologie des Irenäeus*. Gutersloh, 1925.

Brunner, Emil. *Man in Revolt: A Christian Anthropology*. Translated by Olive Wyon. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1939.

Burkitt, F. C. *The Failure of Liberal Christianity*. Cambridge: Bowes & Bowes, 1910.

Cairns, David. *The Image of God in Man*. London: SCM Press, 1953.

Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Translated by Henry Beverridge. Vol. I. Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1953.

Campenhausen, Hans. *The Fathers of the Greek Church*. Translated by Stanley Godman. New York: Pantheon Books Inc., 1959.

Cave, Sydney. *The Christian Estimate of Man*. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1944.

Cayre, F. *Spiritual Writers of the Early Church*. Translated by W. Webster Wilson. New York: Hawthorn Books, Publishers, 1959.

________. *Manual of Patrology*. Translated by H. Howitt. Paris: Desclee & Co., 1927.

Charles, R. H. *Studies in the Apocalypse*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1913.

Cross. F. L. *The Early Christian Fathers*. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1960.

Cullman, Oscar. *Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History*. Translated by Fleyd V. Filson. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1950.

Daniélou, Jean. *Message Évangélique et Culture Hellénistique Aux II^{e} et III^{e} siecles*. Paris, Tournai: Desclée & Co., 1961.

____________. "Saint Irénée et les Origines de la Théologie de l'histoire." *Recherches de Science Religieuse*. 34. Paris, 1947.

____________. *The Bible and Liturgy*. Indiana: The University of Notre Dame Press, 1956.

____________. *Origen*. Translated by Walter Mitchell. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1955.

Daniélou, Jean, and Marrou, Henri. *The First Six Hundred Years*. Translated by Vincent Cronin. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

d'Ales, Adhemar. "La Doctrine de la Récapitulation en Saint Irénée." *Recherches de Science Religieuse*. Paris, 1956.

Deiss, Lucien. *Printemps de la Théologie*. Paris: Éditions Fleurus, 1965.

Dix, Gregory. The Shape of the Liturgy. London: Dacre Press Adam & Charles Black, 1945.

Duchesne, Monsignor Louis. Early History of the Christian Church: From Its Foundation to the End of the Third Century. Vol. I. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1925.

Dodd, C. H. The Apostolic Preaching and Its Development. New York and London: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1936.

Duncker, Ludwig. Des heiligen Irenäus Christologie im Zusammenhange mit dessen theologishen und anthropologishen Grundlehren. Gottingen: bei Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1843.

Elzey, Joseph. "The Meaning of the Goodness of God in the Major Writings of Three Early Church Fathers." Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Boston University, 1963.

Enslin, Morton S. "Irenaeus: Mostly Prolegomena." The Harvard Theological Review. Vol. XL, No. 3, July, 1947.

Eusebius of Cesaerea. "The Church History of Eusebius." Translated by Arthur Cushman McGiffert. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Series Two, Vol. I. Edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1952.

Fairweather, William. Jesus and the Greeks: Early Christianity in the Tideway of Hellenism. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1924.

Foakes-Jackson, F. J. The History of the Christian Church: From the Earliest Times to A.D. 461. New York: George H. Doran Company, 1924.

Fuchs, J. S. Natural Law. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1965.

Galloway, Allan D. The Cosmic Christ. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1951.

Grant, Robert M. "Irenaeus and Hellenistic Culture." *The Harvard Theological Review*. Vol. XLII, No. 1, January, 1949.

————————. *Gnosticism: A Source Book of Heretical Writings from the Early Christian Period*. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1961.

————————. *Gnosticism and Early Christianity*. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1966.

Gregory of Nyssa. "Select Works, Letters." *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. Series Two, Vol. V. Edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Company, 1956.

Gunsalus, Catherine Lee. "The Place of the Concept 'felix culpa' in Christian Doctrine." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University, 1965.

Harakas, Stanley Samuel. "The Natural Law Teaching in the Ante-Nicene Fathers and in Modern Greek Orthodox Theology." Unpublished Ph.D.dissertation, Boston University, 1965.

Harnack, Adolf. *History of Dogma*. Vol. II. Translated from the third German edition by Neil Buchanan. London, Edinburgh, Oxford: Williams and Norgate, 1896.

Harvey, W. Wignan, ed. *Sancti Irenaei*. Vol. I & II. Cambridge: Typis Academicis,(1857), 1965.

Heschel, Abraham J. *Who is Man?* California: Stanford University Press, 1965.

Hick, John. *Evil and the God of Love*. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1966.

Hitchcock, R. R. Montgomery. *Irenaeus of Lugdunum*. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1914.

Hitchcock, R. R. Montgomery. The Treatise of Irenaeus of Lugdunum Against Heresies. (A translation of the principal passages, with notes and arguments). Vol. I & II. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1916.

____________________. "Loofs' Theory of Theophilus of Antioch as a Source of Irenaeus." The Journal of Theological Studies. Vol. 38. Oxford: At the Clarenden Press, 1937.

Holstein, H. "Les Formules du Symbole dans l'oeuvre de Saint Irénée." Recherches de Science Religieuse 34. Paris, 1947.

Hort, Fenton John Anthony. Six Lectures on the Ante-Nicene Fathers. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1895.

Houssiau, Albert. La Christologie de Saint Irénée. Louvain: Publications Universitaires De Louvain, 1955.

Howard, W. F. Christianity according to St. John. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946.

Irenaeus of Lyons. "Against Heresies." The Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. I. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1885.

______________. The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching. Translated from the Armenian with introduction and notes by J. Armitage Robinson. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1920.

______________. Proof of the Apostolic Preaching. Translated by Joseph P. Smith. Maryland: The Newman Press, London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1952.

Jonas, Hans. The Gnostic Religion. Boston: Beacon Press Beacon Hill, 1958.

John of Damascus. "Exposition of the Orthodox Faith." Translated by S. D. F. Salmond. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Series Two, Vol. IX. Edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1963.

Justin Martyr. "The First Apology." "The Second Apology." "Dialogue with Trypho, a Jew." "The Discourse to the Greeks." The Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. I. Edited by James Donaldson and Alexander Roberts. Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1885.

Kelly, J. N. D. Early Christian Creeds. New York: David McKay Company, (1950), 1960.

______________. Early Christian Doctrines. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1959.

Kidd, B. J. A History of the Church to A.D. 313. Vol. I. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1922.

Klebba, Ernst. Die Anthropologie Des Hl. Irenaeus. Münster: Verlag von Heinrich Schöningh, 1894.

Knox, W. L. "Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. 3.3.2." The Journal of Theological Studies. Vol. XLVII. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1946.

Kümmel, Werner Georg. Man in the New Testament. Translated by John J. Vincent. London: The Epworth Press, 1963.

Laeuchli, Samuel. The Language of Faith. New York, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962.

Lake, Kirsopp. The Apostolic Fathers. Vol. I & II. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1952.

Loofs, F. Theophilus von Antiochien Adversus Marcionem und die anderen theologischen Quellen bei Irenaeus. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1930.

Lossky, Vladimir. The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church. London: James Clarke & Co. Ltd., 1957.

Lawson, John. The Biblical Theology of Saint Irenaeus. London: The Epworth Press, 1948.

McGiffert, A. Cushman. A History of Christian Thought. Vol. I. New York, London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932.

Mascall, E. L. The Importance of Being Human. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958.

Mersh, Émile. The Whole Christ: The Historical Development of the Doctrine of the Mystical Body in Scripture and Tradition. Translated by John R. Kelly. London: Dennis Dobson, 1949.

Muelder, Walter G. Moral Law in Christian Social Ethics. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1966.

Neve, J. L. A History of Christian Thought. Vol. I. Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1946.

Niebuhr, Reinhold. The Nature and Destiny of Man. Vol. I. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949.

Norris, R. A. God and the World in Early Christian Theology. New York: Seabury Press, 1965.

Nygren, Anders. Agape and Eros. Part I: A Study of the Christian Idea of Love. Part II: The History of the Christian Idea of Love. Translated by Philip S. Watson. London: S.P.C.K., 1953.

Origen. "De Principiis." "Against Celsus." The Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. IV. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1965.

Patterson, L. G. God and History in Early Christian Thought. New York: The Seabury Press, 1967.

_______________. "The Anti-Origenist Theology of Methodius of Olympus." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1958.

Philippou, A. J. ed. The Orthodox Ethos. Oxford: Holywell Press, 1964.

Philippou, A. J. "The Doctrine of Evil in St. Gregory of Nyssa." Sonderdruck aus *Studia Patristica* IX (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, Band 94). Edited by F. L. Cross. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1966.

Prestige, G. L. *God in Patristic Thought*. London: S.P.C.K., 1959.

Quasten, Johannes. *Patrology*. Vol. I. Westminster: Newman Press, 1950.

Reimherr, Otto. "Irenaeus and the Doctrine of Creation in Second Century Christianity." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1957.

Robinson, H. Wheeler. *The Christian Doctrine of Man*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911.

Sagnard, Francois-M.-M. *La Gnose Valentinienne et le Témoignage de Saint Irénée*. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1947.

Smart, James D. *The Interpretation of Scripture*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961.

Seeberg, Reinhold. *Text-Book of the History of Doctrines*. Vol. I. Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society, 1905.

Stieren, Adolphus. ed. *Sancti Irenaei episcopi Lugdunensis quae supersunt omnia*. Vol. I & II. Leipzig: T. O. Weigel, 1853.

Theophilus of Antioch. "Theophilus to Autolycus." *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Vol. II. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1962.

Thornton, L. S. *Revelation and the Modern World*. London: Dacre Press, 1950.

Thunberg, Lars. *Microcosm and Mediator: The Theological Anthropology of Maximus the Confessor*. Copenhagen, Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup Lund Ejnar Munsksgaard, 1965.

Tixeront, J., and Raemers, S. A. *A Handbook of Patrology*. London: B. Herder Book Co., 1920.

Torrance, Thomas F. *The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers*. Edinburgh, London: Oliver and Boyd, 1948.

Troquer, René Le. *What is Man*? Translated by Eric Earnshaw Smith. New York: Hawthorn Books Publishers, 1961.

Turner, E. W. *The Patristic Doctrine of Redemption*. London: A.R. Mowbray & Co., 1952.

Vernet, F. "Irénée." *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* Vol. VII. Paris: Libraire Letouzey, 1922.

Walker, Williston. *A History of the Christian Church*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1959.

Weber, Simon. ed. *Sancti Irenaei Demonstratio Apostolicae Praedicationis*. Friburgi Brisgoviae, 1917.

Werner, Johannes. *Der Paulinismus des Irenaeus*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs' sche Buchhandlung, 1889.

Wiles, Maurice. *The Christian Fathers*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1966.

Wingren, Gustaf. *Theology in Conflict*. Translated by Eric H. Wahlstrom. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1958.

———. *Gospel and Church*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964.

———. *Creation and Law*. Translated by Ross Mackenzie. Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1961.

———. *Man and the Incarnation: A Study in the Biblical Theology of Irenaeus*. Translated by Ross Mackenzie. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959.

Williams, N. P. The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin. London, New York, Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co., 1927.

Wolfson, Harry Austryn. The Philosophy of the Church Fathers. Vol. I. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.

________________________. Philo. Vol. I. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947.

World Council of Churches. Fourth Assembly, Uppsala, July 1968, Committee I, document No. 4, Policy Ref. Committee I, document No. 1, Plenary Business Document No. 53.

Holy Bible

Revised Standard Version. Toronto, New York, Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1952.

The Greek New Testament. Edited by Kurt Arland et. al. New York: American Bible Society, 1966.

Abstract

The problem of this dissertation is to define and describe the theological anthropology of Irenaeus of Lyons. The method employed is historical, descriptive and analytical. The primary sources used for Irenaeus' doctrine of man are his own writings, i.e. *Against Heresies* and *Proof of the Apostolic Preaching*. The relevant secondary sources have also been read and were used for the present writing.

Man, created by the Triune God, constitutes a theological being whose origin, nature and destiny are all in God. Man is made in the image and likeness of God. *Imago Dei* characterizes man as a rational and free being, especially in contrast to the rest of the creation, but the full realization of *Imago Dei* is found only in the man who is restored in Christ and who continues to grow through the Spirit.

By defining the first man as νήπιος and emphasizing his need to grow, Irenaeus presents a teleological or developmental anthropology. Parallel with this idea is the teaching that the perfect image of man is in Christ, not in Adam. Thus Irenaeus works out his anthropology in correlation to Christology.

When interpreting the fall of man, Irenaeus introduces "the demonic structrue of evil," by taking into account

the iconotropy of the serpent in the Genesis narrative of the Fall. Irenaeus speaks of Adam's sin and its impact on his descendants to show the grace of Second Adam, Christ; but on account of his understanding of the Evil One as the lord of sin and death and the primal man as νήπιος, man's image is not completely distorted by the fall as it is in the Augustinian system.

The real essence of the theological anthropology of Irenaeus is that he makes the "economy of the Son" the very center of his doctrine of man. In his doctrine of the Incarnation Irenaeus presents perfect God and perfect man who entered into communion with us in order that we can become the sons of God by the power of His Holy Spirit. On the Cross two things occur, i.e. the overcoming of the source of man's sin, the Devil, and the forgiveness of man's sin. The love of God reaches a climax on the Cross, because it is there that man encounters the God who does not refuse the pain of being human. The true victory of the death on the Cross is manifest in the Resurrection of Christ, which was the surest example of His final victory over death and was a promise of ours.

The economy of the Holy Spirit also has a very distinctive place in Irenaeus' soteriology. The Holy Spirit is He who continues the work of Christ in the Church. In his eschatology

Irenaeus speaks of the coming earthly Kingdom of the Lord and exhibits a strong notion of God's reward and judgment that will take place at the end of that Kingdom.

In his doctrine of recapitulation and deification, the real triumph of God's grace is manifest. Christ restores what the primal man lost by his disobedience and leads to the perfection of the creation by summing up in Himself the whole human race from the beginning to the end. However, recapitulation is also presented as an activity. In this aspect we see a definite continuity between the *finished* work of Christ and the divinely active work of the Holy Spirit, between the theory of man as νήπιος and as one who is destined to grow, and between the Church existing "in between times" and the final consummation.

In the aspect of recapitulation as "interpenetration" Irenaeus presents the idea of deification. Deification does not mean that man becomes God in the sense of being identical with His being, but that He becomes fully man in Christ. Deification means becoming man in Christ, i.e. attaining perfection by the work of the Triune God.

The positive anthropology of Irenaeus does not lessen the Theocentricity; for the glory of man is God, and unification with God constitutes the fulfillment of his humanity.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY

Miss Dai Sil Kim was born in a small town of North Korea on July 13, 1938 as the fifth child of Mr. and Mrs. Moon Ryang Kim. She came to Seoul, Korea in 1945 with her family to escape from the Communists and to seek for freedom under the democratic government of South Korea. She had five years' of happy school life until the Korean war broke out in 1950.

Despite the tragic result of the war, her family all survived and the painstaking effort of her well-educated parents made it possible for her to continue her education. She went to Ewha Girls' Junior and Senior High School and graduated from that school with honors in 1956. Her involvement in human suffering during the Korean war made her deeply religious and led her to go to the Methodist Theological College where she spent four years and graduated *summa cum laude* in 1960.

She taught for two and half years in Ewha Girls' High School until she was on her way to America to get an advanced education. She came to Boston University School of Theology in September, 1962 and spent three years under the S.T.B. with doctoral objective program. In 1965 she was admitted to Boston University Graduate School as a Ph.D candidate. While attending the university, she was engaged in Church work on week-ends and she was also a graduate assistant in Church History department for two years.